OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES

General Editors

Gillian Clark Andrew Louth

THE OXFORD EARLY CHRISTIAN STUDIES series includes scholarly volumes on the thought and history of the early Christian centuries. Covering a wide range of Greek, Latin, and Oriental sources, the books are of interest to theologians, ancient historians, and specialists in the classical and Jewish worlds.

Titles in the series include:

The Body in St Maximus the Confessor
Holy Flesh, Wholly Deified
Adam G. Cooper (2005)

The Asketikon of St Basil the Great
Anna M. Silvas (2005)

Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians
Stephen Andrew Cooper (2005)

Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine
The Career of Peter the Iberian
Cornelia B. Horn (2006)

Marcellus of Ancyra and the Lost Years of the Arian Controversy 325–345
Sara Parvis (2006)

The Irrational Augustine
Catherine Conybeare (2006)

Clement of Alexandria and the Beginnings of Christian Apophaticism
Henny Fiskâ Hägg (2006)

The Christology of Theodoret of Cyrus
Antiochene Christology from the Council of Ephesus (431)
to the Council of Chalcedon (451)
Paul B. Clayton, Jr. (2006)

Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*
Aaron P. Johnson (2006)

Union and Distinction in the Thought of St Maximus the Confessor
Melchisedec Törönen (2007)

Contextualizing Cassian
Aristocrats, Asceticism, and Reformation in Fifth-Century Gaul
Richard J. Goodrich (2007)

Ambrosiaster's Political Theology
Sophie Lunn-Rockliffe (2007)

Coptic Christology in Practice
Incarnation and Divine Participation in Late Antique and Medieval Egypt
Stephen Davis (2008)

Possidius of Calama
A Study of the North African Episcopate in the Age of Augustine
Erica T. Hermanowicz

Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church

VOLKER L. MENZE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Volker L. Menze 2008

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2008

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Menze, Volker-Lorenz, 1974–
Justinian and the making of the Syrian Orthodox Church / Volker L. Menze.
p. cm.— (Oxford early Christian studies)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN–13: 978–0–19–953487–6
1. Syrian Orthodox Church—History. 2. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca.
30–600. 3. Justinian, Emperor of Rome, 483?–565. I. Title
BX173.3.M46 2008
281'.6309021—dc22 2008002518

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham, Wiltshire

978–0–19–953487–6

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Meinen Eltern

Acknowledgements

This book started as a Ph.D. thesis at the History Department of Princeton University and it is my pleasure to express my gratitude to many people who made this study possible. Peter Brown and Neil McLynn introduced me in a seminar to the non-Chalcedonians and made me aware of the potential that the post-Chalcedonian period had for scholarly research. Peter Brown in his very cheerful way pushed me to think harder about the religious controversies of the sixth century. He was an outstanding dissertation adviser whose enthusiasm makes all his graduate students feel that their research is leading to the discovery of a new world.

Averil Cameron patiently guided my naive steps through early Byzantine history when I was a visiting graduate student at Oxford, and later kindly agreed to become one of my dissertation examiners. I am grateful that she always took a warm interest in my work. The same holds true for Johannes Hahn from whose support I have profited immensely throughout the last decade: in his first term at Münster he found time to teach me late antique history in a one-on-one tutorial, and he read the whole thesis and provided valuable comments when I returned to Münster. He facilitated my work as his *Assistent* in every way possible and gave me the time to convert the thesis into a book.

I would like to thank the editors of Oxford Early Christian Studies, Gillian Clark and Andrew Louth, for including my study in their series. They as well as an anonymous reader provided helpful comments on the whole book. Richard Price kindly read and improved the final version.

While writing the dissertation in Princeton I was lucky to have support from Manolis Papoutsakis who generously offered to read some of the Syriac texts with me—without him this study would not have been possible. Tia Kolbaba always had an open door for me and my questions and made the History Department a friendly place. Other teachers who took an interest in my work were equally crucial for the making of this study: Susan Ashbrook Harvey, Bill Jordan,

Dieter Korol, Jochen Martin, Kathleen McVey, Alison Salvesen, and Brent Shaw. At times even more important, however, were friends on whose invaluable friendship I could rely and who contributed in one way or the other to this book: Kutlu Akalin, Edip Aydin, Brooke Blower, Craig Caldwell, Christiane Dahms, Cordula Garmer, Niels Gaul, Matthias Haake, Stefan Hunfeld, Ryan Jordan, Adam Mosley, Clara Oberle, Sabine Panzram, Andrea Podhorsky, Dan Schwartz, Mitra Sharafi, Klaus Veigel, and Massimo Vitiello.

I am grateful to Jürgen Haffke who was the first to kindle my interest in history. Above all though, I owe most to my parents Ursula and Dietmar Menze who have always unselfishly supported me and believed in me throughout the years. To them this book is dedicated.

Volker Menze

Münster i.Westf.
September 2007

Contents

Abbreviations x

Introduction 1
1. The Schism of the Non-Chalcedonians 12
2. The *Libellus* of Hormisdas: a Remodelling of the Past 58
3. Monks and Monasteries 106
4. Towards a Church: Sacraments, Canons, Liturgy, and Priests 145
5. Syrian Orthodox Commemoration of the Past 194

Conclusion: Justinian, the Syrian Orthodox 536-553, and Subsequent Perceptions of the Sixth-Century Schism 247

Bibliography 277
Index 307

Abbreviations

In general see Siegfried Schwertner, ²*IATG. Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter ²1992; here only a small selection is noted, including some new abbreviations not listed in ²*IATG*.

Aug.	*Augustinianum*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
ChH	*Church History*
EOr	*Échos d'Orient*
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*
Hugoye	*Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies*
JCSSS	*Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
OrChr	*Oriens Christianus*
OstKSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien*
POC	*Proche-Orient Chrétien*
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum/Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity
StOKG	Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte
TeCLA	Texts from Christian Late Antiquity
ZS	*Zeitschrift für Semitistik*
ZSRG.K	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonische Abteilung*

Introduction

> *Although we can attribute the existence of a Church to the dynamic energy of the Holy Spirit, we cannot attribute its structure to anything other than to the praxis of human beings.*[1]

The German Catholic theologian Hans Küng defines 'Church' as the 'community of those who believe in Christ [...], *Congregatio* or *Communio Christifidelium*'.[2] The term 'Church' stands for an assembly of believers who share the belief in Jesus Christ and the New Testament—presupposing the Old Testament. This definition, however, is not sufficient to describe a social institution that took on many responsibilities in the ancient world. It describes an ideal church, but not a church in a historical setting with its ecclesiastical structure, hierarchy of priests, liturgy, and sacraments. Hans Küng is of course aware of this distinction, and in his book which he plainly calls *The Church*, he places the (Catholic) Church in its historical setting of the New Testament period as well as into the twentieth century, emphasizing the changing understanding of its ecclesiology and image over time.[3] While it was possible for a learned theologian like Hans Küng to write such a broad book, the average historian must be content to focus on a narrower section of history.

This book is dedicated to a small facet of the rich history of the Christian Church. It historicizes the split between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, that is, the split between those Christians who

[1] R. Imboden, *The Church, A Demon Lover: A Sartrean Analysis of an Institution*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press 1995, xiv.

[2] H. Küng, *Christianity: Its Essence and History*, London: SCM Press 1995, 78.

[3] H. Küng, *The Church*, London: Burns & Oates 1967, especially 3–39, 70–104, and 224–60.

accepted the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and those who rejected it. It focuses on the establishment of an independent non-Chalcedonian (later so-called) Syrian Orthodox Church in the first half of the sixth century.[4] In other words, the study analyses how emperors in the late Roman or early Byzantine empire dealt (in the end) unsuccessfully with a dissident religious group and how this group founded its own church in the post-Chalcedonian period.

As for the terminology, the term 'non-Chalcedonian' is employed instead of 'monophysite', a biased term still common in western scholarship.[5] More recently other terms have been offered, most prominently 'miaphysite' and 'anti-Chalcedonian'.[6] The term 'miaphysite' ('one nature') emphasizes the Christological aspect of the non-Chalcedonian dissent by pointing out that the opponents of Chalcedon rejected the Chalcedonian 'dyophysite' ('two-natures') formula for Christ. As this book deals mainly with historical and not Christological issues, the term 'miaphysite' seems less appropriate. As 'anti-Chalcedonian' gives the impression that the later so-called Syrian Orthodox defined themselves and established their church primarily against this council, it again gives dogmatic discussions more weight than they

[4] At the time, this church included both Syriac- and Greek-speaking Christians, but later Syriac became dominant. The Syriac Christian tradition, including among other churches the Syrian Orthodox Church, has attracted a growing interest in recent decades: International Syriac Symposia have existed since 1972, North American Syriac Symposia since 1991, and the Catholic Church sponsors non-official consultations with the Syrian Churches which are published in *Pro Oriente*. Furthermore, with the establishment of Gorgias Press, a (Syrian Orthodox) publisher was founded that specializes in the Syrian tradition.

[5] Already E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, ABAW.PH 10, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1934, 171 n. 1 noted the insufficiency of the term 'Monophysites'; D. Winkler, 'Monophysites', in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1999, 586–8. Especially for the Church of the East, but also in general for terminology see S. Brock, 'The "Nestorian" Church: A Lamentable Misnomer', in *The Church of the East: Life and Thought*, ed. J. F. Coakley and K. Parry, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78.3 (1996), 23–35 [reprinted in S. Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2006].

[6] D. Winkler, 'Miaphysitism: A new Term for Use in the History of Dogma and in Ecumenical Theology', *The Harp* 10 (1997), 33–40. For 'anti-Chalcedonians' see C. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006, 8f.

should have.[7] A dogmatic split began here, but the establishment of the Syrian Orthodox Church in the course of the sixth century was caused by historical events which placed the non-Chalcedonians in opposition to the (Chalcedonian) church of the empire in the time of Justin and Justinian. The book argues that the adherence to non-Chalcedonian persons and traditions, and the understanding of the post-451 as well as the pre-451 past became crucial, and played a greater role than the council as it took place in 451. Therefore the term 'non-Chalcedonian' seems to be the most appropriate. In the title, the term *Syrian Orthodox Church* is used as this is the official name of this non-Chalcedonian church which still exists today.[8] For the sixth century the term 'Syrian Orthodox' does not imply an ethnic affiliation, as most non-Chalcedonian bishops were bilingual, and there was hardly anything exclusively Syrian about the church.[9] The term 'Nestorian' was used by non-Chalcedonians in order to disqualify the Chalcedonians and attach them to a dyophysite doctrine that at this time was generally regarded as heretical. When used here, the term therefore expresses the non-Chalcedonian perception of Chalcedonians and does not refer to followers of the Church of the East.[10]

The study relies on sources beyond the horizon of Procopius and the Chalcedonian chronicles or church histories on the one side, and John of Ephesus and non-Chalcedonian chronicles on the other.[11]

[7] The Syrian Orthodox did not accept the Chalcedonian definition of faith, but they placed the disciplinary canons of Chalcedon among their church canons. In other words, the Council of Chalcedon was adopted even by the non-Chalcedonians (see Chapter 2).

[8] S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 87–121 also refers to them in this way. Throughout history they were often called 'Jacobites' after Jacob Baradaeus, but they 'repudiate the title "Jacobite"' today; see Ignatius Zakka I. Iwas, Patriarch of the Holy See of Antioch, 'The Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch at a Glance', in *Syrian Orthodox Resources* (1983) (http://sor.cua.edu/Pub/PZakka1/SOCAtAGlance.html), 14.

[9] D. Weltecke, *Die «Beschreibung der Zeiten» von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199). Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographischen Kontext*, Leuven: Peeters 2003, 44.

[10] For the Church of the East and its terminology see Brock, 'The "Nestorian" Church: A Lamentable Misnomer' and M. Gaddis, 'Nestorius', in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1999, 603f.

[11] Translations of unpublished material, and also of published material for which no English translation exists, are my own. If English translations of published material were available, they have been used except where indicated.

Although all these sources, namely the *Chronicon Paschale*, Marcellinus *comes*, John Malalas, Evagrius Scholasticus, John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints* and his *Church History* (as it survives in Ps.-Dionysius/*Chronicle of Zuqnin*), Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's *Church History*, Michael the Syrian's *Chronicle* and the minor Syrian Chronicles are used, these sources alone cannot provide scholars with a sufficient understanding of the religious controversies of the sixth century.[12] The reports and documents from the church councils and conversations in 518, 532/3 and 536 in Constantinople which in general are under-studied are taken into account.[13] Also the collections of letters between Pope Hormisdas and the court in Constantinople, the collections of Severus' letters, letters by Philoxenus of Mabbug and Jacob of Sarug, and unpublished letters by John of Tella, Severus of Antioch, Thomas of Germanicia, Constantine of Laodicea, and Antoninus of Aleppo are explored extensively. Since the letters to the councils, the acts of the councils and the letters by the non-Chalcedonian bishops constitute contemporary documents, they are highly valuable sources. They often present a more reliable picture than the commemoration of persons or events as reported decades later by biased—Chalcedonian as well as non-Chalcedonian—historians and chroniclers.

It is necessary to ask what all these texts can offer, but also what they might try to conceal. When read against the grain they can bring to light the issues at hand, and this study tries to offer sensible explanations of how to understand certain developments or, for example, people's motivations to act as they did. Because of the scarcity of evidence, some of the conclusions—rather than being based on 'hard' facts—are offered as conjectures to explain gaps. But as the late Keith Hopkins has rightly remarked: 'Only the naïve still believe that facts or "evidence" are the only, or even the most important ingredients of history.'[14]

[12] Whether Ps.-Zachariah's work is a *Church History* or a *Chronicle* is debated; see G. Greatrex, 'Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene: The Context and Nature of his Work', *JCSSS* 6 (2006), 39–52, especially 44–6, who argues that it can probably be regarded as church history.

[13] Already Eduard Schwartz has commented that sadly the proceedings of church councils have not been read enough by scholars. The German theologian Jacob Speigl has focused on these (minor) church councils and conversations; see his articles in the bibliography.

[14] K. Hopkins, 'Christian Number and its Implications', *JECS* 6 (1998), 186.

Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church does not provide the history of an 'epoch' which has attracted scholars to the time of Justinian.[15] It also differs from previous studies which are mainly concerned with theology *per se*, such as the studies by Roberta Chesnut covering the three major non-Chalcedonian theologians Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Sarug, or Alois Grillmeier, who dedicated his scholarly work to the theology after Chalcedon.[16] The book offers *une histoire événementielle.* Chronology has often been neglected as it seems to be well-known. However, a solid chronology established by assessing the different sources is necessary to draw any conclusion about historical change. In the tradition of Ernest Honigmann, to whom the study owes much, prosopography is also taken seriously as only the study of persons involved and the offices they held can help modern scholars to judge if certain events were fundamental or peripheral.[17]

On another level, the book presents a study of the past, and not only on the past of the sixth century from a modern perspective: it also analyses the commemoration of the past by sixth-century authors. Here it draws on works by Jan Assmann, who—among others—identifies the culture of remembrance as crucial for the

[15] In fact, the time of Justinian has attracted monumental works: Ch. Diehl, *Justinien et la Civilisation Byzantine au VIe siècle*, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1901; B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 2 vols. (second vol. ed. C. Capizzi), Berlin: de Gruyter 1960/95; O. Mazal, *Justinian und seine Zeit. Geschichte und Kultur des Byzantinischen Reiches im 6. Jahrhundert*, Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau 2001; M. Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2003; smaller volumes include J. Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1966; and J. Evans, *The Age of Justinian: The Circumstances of Imperial Power*, London and New York: Routledge 1996. Justinian's predecessor, Justin I, has received much less attention, but A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1950 remains a thorough study.

[16] R. Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Sarug*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1976; A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3 vols., Würzburg: Echter 1951–4; and A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, 4 vols., Freiburg: Herder 1986–2002 completed after his death with the assistance of several internationally renowned scholars.

[17] Especially Honigmann's *Évêques et Évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951 remains fundamental.

self-understanding of groups, especially in religious contexts.[18] The past is used as a point of reference, and the commemoration of a collective past can be used to form a sense of community and identity. Therefore the past as modern historians reconstruct it as 'history' does not play the primary role; rather non-Chalcedonians shaped the past according to the needs and the framework of their sixth-century present.

As the ideology of the late Roman empire had become thoroughly Christian, it was impossible for a Roman and Byzantine emperor to rule an empire that was divided into different branches of Christianity. It was the emperor's task to ensure that all his subjects were united to God in one belief, which also needed to be the belief of God's representative on earth—the emperor.[19] Since Constantine in the fourth century, emperors struggled to define the belief of the church of the empire and to defend it against considerable minority beliefs. The opponents of the Council of Nicaea (325)—also called 'Arians', a highly questionable term coined by the followers of Nicaea—mark a prime example: for a good part of the fourth century emperors favoured them, and even after imperial favour turned against them, their doctrine could not be completely erased in the Roman empire because it remained the faith of much-needed mercenary troops—especially the Goths.[20]

Non-Chalcedonianism never became the favoured faith of a certain people or dominant among the military, but it challenged Roman emperors tremendously as it had many followers mainly in the eastern patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Although the Council of Chalcedon in 451 had tried to reconcile eastern and western views on Christology, it was in the end the papal understanding of Christ which won the day. Pope Leo (440–61) had drawn up a doctrinal letter in June 449, the famous *Tome* of Leo,

[18] J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich: C. H. Beck 1992; *idem*, *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Zehn Studien*, Munich: C. H. Beck 2000.

[19] F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, vol. ii, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks 1966, 724–850.

[20] For terminology see Chapter 1. Not before 538 did the emperor allow the Chalcedonians to take over 'Arian' property; see G. Greatrex, 'Justin I and the Arians', *PatrSt* 34 (2001), 72–81.

which regarded Christ as existing in two natures (dyophysitism) also after the incarnation. The division of Christ into two subjects, one of whom is divine and the other suffers like a human, was unbearable to easterners.[21] Accepting this formula in 451 prevented the bishops present at the Council of Chalcedon from finding a compromise which would have accommodated the theological views of those Christians who adhered to a miaphysite Christology.[22] The Chalcedonian formula antagonized easterners and, claiming to follow the rather miaphysite Christological tradition of Cyril, the powerful patriarch of Alexandria (412–44), Christians in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria refused to accept it.[23]

Post-451 emperors tried to integrate both Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians into the church of the empire. Constantinople stood not only geographically, but also theologically, in the middle between Rome in the West and the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria in the East. Whereas the papacy in Rome upheld the faith of Leo, easterners—both Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians—defended Cyril's Christology. Emperors tried to conceal the differences and hold the extremes together in one belief, but as Rome broke communion with Constantinople after the publication of the *Henoticon* in 482 they failed.[24] The following decades saw Constantinople shifting eastwards towards a miaphysite Christological understanding as the doctrine of the imperial church. However, in 518 the accession of Justin I and the enforcement of Chalcedon

[21] W. Elert, 'Die theopaschitische Formel', *ThLZ* 75 (1950), 196–206, especially 200f. See also the theopaschite discussions in Chapters 1 and 4.

[22] For Pope Leo see D. Wyrwa, 'Leo I., der Große', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 447–9; and H. Rahner, 'Leo der Große, der Papst des Konzils', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 323–39; for the Council of Chalcedon see now *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols., trans. with introduction and notes by R. Price and M. Gaddis, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005, especially the introduction in vol. i.

[23] For Cyril see J. A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, Leiden: Brill 1994; and now also S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004. For the problem of the Cyrillian Christological legacy in the Christological debates of the sixth century see Chapter 2.

[24] For the *Henoticon* see Chapter 1.

throughout the East caused the ultimate split between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

The book analyses the steps that non-Chalcedonian bishops took in exile after 518 in order to establish an independent church. The decisive moment for the separation was the *libellus* of Pope Hormisdas which Justin enforced after 518, and which forced the non-Chalcedonian bishops to either submit to the visible erasure of their tradition or resist imperial order. The visibility of submission was important—as important as it was for those who resisted to show their dissent in public. Religious unity or disunity became visible in action, and only dissident belief that found its expression in heterodox preaching and writing in the case of the clergy, or in the laity's search for *heteropraxis*, that is, their search for sacraments (especially baptism and Eucharist) offered by heterodox clerics, posed a problem for the Chalcedonian bishops and was punishable by the imperial administration.

The *libellus* requested that all bishops whom Rome regarded as heretical be erased from the diptychs in every church in the East. Liturgical diptychs (lit. 'twofold') were writing tablets which contained names of dead and living persons which the church wished to commemorate. They were read out in the church before the consecration and formed part of the liturgy. By commemorating apostles, saints, local bishops, and so forth, the local church defined their Christian tradition from the apostolic times to the present day.[25] If the non-Chalcedonian bishops had given in to the papal request, they would have lost their tradition and their claim to the apostolic past. Thereby the papacy wished to establish a liturgy which gave no room for—from the papal perspective—heterodox understanding of the ecclesiastical past.

The bishops and monks who refused to sign the *libellus* in 518 did so visibly, as they went into exile. There they shared a different (non-Chalcedonian) Eucharist which was celebrated while a liturgy was read out in which non-Chalcedonian persons were commemorated through the diptychs. Also the 'thrice-holy hymn', the *Trisagion*, which had constituted part of the liturgy since the fifth century, became a matter of dispute between the non-Chalcedonians and the Chalcedonians.[26] All non-Chalcedonians in exile (monks and clerics)

[25] For the diptychs see Chapter 2.

[26] For the Trisagion see Chapter 4.

shared the experience of persecution and discrimination by the Chalcedonians in power. This historical experience became important for their self-understanding and for later commemorations of this heroic past by non-Chalcedonian historians like John of Ephesus.[27] Non-Chalcedonians found their strength through the preservation of their tradition, which was made available in Greek and Syriac. The non-Chalcedonian bishop John of Tella started mass ordinations in the 520s, which in the 540s even allowed the non-Chalcedonians to become a missionary church. The non-Chalcedonians established a separate hierarchy adhering to the theology of the former non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Severus, and the metropolitan of Mabbug, Philoxenus, and observing the canons written for them by John of Tella and other non-Chalcedonian bishops. All this together led to the formation of a separate non-Chalcedonian church, the Syrian Orthodox Church, within thirty-five years after the accession of Justin I in 518.

Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church covers these thirty-five years from the beginning of the Chalcedonian rule with Justin I in 518 until the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, accepted as the fifth ecumenical council by European Christianity. The title seems justified, however, as it was certainly Justinian who as emperor most influenced—even if unwillingly—the development of the churches and the establishment of a dissenting church in this period. Justinian planned the Second Council of Constantinople to be a reconciliation council for the non-Chalcedonians, but it failed. The heated discussion it caused among Greek and Latin theologians proves its importance for the shaping of European Christianity. The non-Chalcedonians, however, did not even attend it, and the council caused hardly any repercussions in their tradition. It is therefore regarded here as an endpoint for the establishment of the Syrian Orthodox Church even though the full establishment of an episcopal hierarchy took place in the second half of the sixth century.

Scholars' attempts to describe the struggle over Chalcedon in purely social or nationalistic terms have failed. Religious matters must be accepted on their own terms, and as Peter Brown observed,

[27] See Chapter 5.

are as 'real' as social factors and other forces in late antique society.[28] In this time of heated theological discussions, however, it is extremely difficult for scholars to catch the interests of the average lay Christian in a discourse led by clerical intellectuals on both sides. Did the laity have a standpoint at all, and if so, were average Christians able to articulate it? Christian authors usually remember examples of non-average persons and confront modern scholars with Christians who stood out for their steadfastness, their faith, and so on, or—in opposition to the model Christian—persons who proved to be especially vicious or cruel. The first could be regarded as models for the fellow believers, the latter as villains from whom one should disassociate oneself. Scholars can hardly regard these types—which are found for example very prominently in John of Ephesus' hagiography—as representative for the average Christian.

However, there are a few instances where the interests of the laity became visible and understandable. The question of whom the local church commemorated in their diptychs—thereby establishing a tradition of local identity—seems to have been important to the entire (local) Christian community. Their interest in including local bishops could sometimes clash with their bishops' understanding of 'orthodox' confessional diptychs. The same opposition between the laity and their bishops is obvious concerning martyr shrines to which Chalcedonian as well as non-Chalcedonian laity went because they believed in the power of martyrs—regardless of whether Chalcedonian or non-Chalcedonian clergy administered the shrine. Bishops warned their flock, probably often in vain, not to take part in ceremonies or sacraments offered by their opponents. More difficult for scholars to understand are the non-Chalcedonian laity's requests for more ordained priests in the 520s. It seems likely that not 'average' Christians but monks, who can hardly be regarded as representative for the laity in general, were at the forefront here.[29] The same is true for local riots, which at least in Amida in 521/2 were led by monks, although perhaps less so in Constantinople in

[28] P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England 2001, 107.

[29] See Chapter 3.

512 concerning the addition to the Trisagion or in 533 against Chalcedon.[30]

The book also offers a study in church history in the sense that it takes theological matters seriously, but at the same time understands that theology might have been a rather secular business. Individuals involved in the Christological debate of the fifth and sixth centuries brought in their personal agenda, which often reflected their political interests. That is especially true for the emperors, for whom only their public image survives, not what might have been their personal beliefs. Post-Chalcedonian emperors needed to pay special attention to their religious policy. Even if a complete doctrinal unity among all bishops could hardly ever be reached, at least a superficial harmony was necessary to rule the Christian Roman empire. Openly pronounced disagreement as it took place after 518 forced the emperor to search for new ways to find unity for the church of the empire. It is therefore no accident that Justinian's rule saw many councils or discussions of faith. The disunity of Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians could not be ignored, and instead of reacting to an episcopal discourse Justinian tried actively to lead the course of the doctrinal discussions by instituting himself as an emperor-theologian. However, this public image of Justinian as well as of Justin and Theodora in matters of faith has been taken too much at face value. A reassessment of their role in the imperial religious policy is necessary and will be offered here.

In many respects, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* can only be regarded as an introduction to the study of the foundational period of the Syrian Orthodox Church. It is more than a convention to say that there is much lacking, and others may wish to modify the conclusions drawn up here. However, if the study lays some groundwork and serves to generate more interest and research on the topic, it has fulfilled its purpose.

[30] For the riot in Amida see Chapter 3, for 512 see Chapter 4, for 533 see Chapter 5.

1

The Schism of the Non-Chalcedonians

THE CONTROVERSIES OVER NICAEA AND CHALCEDON

When the emperor Constantine (306–37) privileged Christianity he could not have envisioned that questions about the Trinity and the arising controversies over Christology, that is, the understanding of the divine and human natures of Christ, would constantly upset not only the late antique church in the following centuries but also the entire later Roman empire. Already in his lifetime, dogmatic controversies called upon his authority and required his full attention. The later so-called 'Arian controversy' brought about the first ecumenical council in history, the Council of Nicaea in 325. It condemned Arius, a presbyter from Alexandria, who had challenged his bishop with his understanding that Christ was not coeternal with his father. Nevertheless, the victory of the Nicenes, the adherents of the Council of Nicaea, was short-lived. Constantine himself reconsidered the decisions of Nicaea and became the first of several emperors in the course of the fourth century who favoured a non-Nicene church of the empire.[1]

[1] Athanasius (see below) intended to belittle Arius' followers by arguing that they were no longer 'Christians' but 'Arians', and later Nicenes subsumed to the term 'Arians' all kinds of 'heresies'. The term 'non-Nicenes' is preferred here to the term 'Arians' as the non-Nicenes differed in their theology and cannot all be regarded as followers of Arius. However, the terminology is still under debate. See R. P. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000, 30–78, especially 72; L. Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004, especially 100–66; later Ayres also discusses the term '(pro-)Nicenes'. For a theological terminology in the first

The most prominent victim of Constantine's adherence to a non-Nicene position became Athanasius, who attended the Council of Nicaea as a young deacon and was later enthroned as bishop of Alexandria. A staunch defender of the Council of Nicaea, he opposed the non-Nicene policy of the emperors, who, in return, sent him into exile. While hiding in exile for the third time (356–62), Athanasius remarked in his *History of the Arians*—'Arians' being a scornful label given to all opponents of Nicaea even though the theology of the non-Nicenes differed widely—about the rule of the non-Nicenes in power that they

> surpass the Jews in their devices, [...] this modern and accursed heresy, when it is overthrown by argument, when it is cast down and covered with shame by the very Truth, forthwith endeavours to coerce by violence and stripes and imprisonment those whom it has been unable to persuade by argument, thereby acknowledging itself to be anything rather than godly. For it is part of true godliness not to compel, but to persuade.[2]

Athanasius had first-hand experience of the coercive force used by state officials against him, and his time in exile strongly influenced his work. Later generations of Nicene Christians remembered his sufferings for the faith and commemorated him as a champion of orthodoxy. One bishop who saw himself very much in the tradition of the 'God-clad' doctor Athanasius was Severus, patriarch of Antioch (512–18).[3] Severus not only shared the experience of exile with Athanasius, but the latter's works were also part of the Christian tradition the patriarch of Antioch had read and made use of in his

half of the fourth century see J. T. Lienhard, 'The "Arian" Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered', *TS* 48 (1987), 415–37; for the second half of the fourth century see also H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1988. For Arius and his theology see especially R. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 2001. In general cf. also R. P. C. Hanson's voluminous book: *The Search for the Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1988—a title that points out the theological goal of the disputes in the fourth century.

[2] Athanasius, *History of the Arians* 66f., trans. in *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria*, trans. A. Robertson, NPNF 4, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1953, 294f. For Athanasius see D. Brakke, *Athanasius and Asceticism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995, 129f.; T. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1993, 121–35.

[3] Severus, *A Collection of Letters* 69, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, in *PO* 14, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1920, 88. For a short introduction to Severus see now P. Allen and C. T. R. Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, London and New York: Routledge 2004.

homilies and letters.[4] Athanasius' image of church and state drawn up almost two hundred years earlier was still understood in the sixth century.

In the *History of the Arians*, Athanasius created a very drastic image of the emperor Constantius II as persecutor of orthodox Christians. Michael Gaddis remarks that the non-Nicenes were not only believed to have lost the argument about orthodoxy in the debates, but were also accused of being wrong because of their dependence on violence and imperial power: 'religion coerced could never be true religion—and by extension, that the use of violent coercion inherently delegitimized the cause for which it was used'.[5] Since Christianity had gained its privileged status, to be labelled as a persecutor became dangerous for emperors and government officials alike. Constantius II did not handle this matter well in the eyes of the Nicenes, and his memory was damaged permanently by Athanasius' writings.

Generations later Severus could draw on Athanasius' example in order to explain his ambivalent relationship to the state, and especially its rulers, the emperors in Constantinople. Whereas Athanasius had defended the first ecumenical council, Severus became a protagonist and the leading theologian of those Christians who refuted the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which European Christianity later considered the fourth ecumenical council. Christians in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, however, considered the Council of Chalcedon as a late victory of Nestorius, the former patriarch of Constantinople (428–31), who had been deposed by Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria (412–44), and by the Council of Ephesus in 431 for his extreme dyophysitism.[6] Although Chalcedon approved of this decision, the council also deposed Dioscorus who was not only Cyril's successor as

[4] See for example, Severus, *Collection of Letters* 93, Brooks, 174f.

[5] M. Gaddis, *There is No Crime for Those who have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2005, 78.

[6] At least the sessions held by Cyril and his party were later accepted as the ecumenical Council of Ephesus, although the supporters of Nestorius convened—separately from Cyril—at Ephesus as well. See E. Chrysos, 'Konzilspräsident und Konzilsvorstand. Zur Frage des Vorsitzes in den Konzilien der byzantinischen Reichskirche', *AHC* 11 (1979), 1–17, here 2–9; S. Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004. See also Introduction.

patriarch of Alexandria (444–51) but also regarded himself theologically as the true disciple of Cyril and was strictly opposed to dyophysite Christology. His doctrinal position was not judged, but the council deposed him for having received the archimandrite Eutyches—who had been condemned as a heretic before (at a council in Constantinople in 448) and was anathematized again at Chalcedon—into communion at the Second Council of Ephesus in 449.[7] The biased treatment of Eutyches in the sources prevents scholars to establish an objective image of him, but he seems to have been the other extreme of Nestorius—a real monophysite in the eyes of the Chalcedonians as well as the non-Chalcedonians.[8]

In the aftermath of Chalcedon some Christian groups discontent with the Chalcedonian definition of faith rebelled against their religious authorities—most notably the Palestinian monks against Juvenal, the bishop of Jerusalem, in the 450s.[9] As the emperor Marcian (450–7) had been one of the leading figures behind the Council of Chalcedon, he suppressed the rebellion and tried to resolve dissent by banishing unruly bishops. However, since this was met with only temporary success, later emperors in the following half-century attempted to pacify both groups in order to rule the empire as smoothly as possible.

This policy found its written form in the *Henoticon*, an imperial edict of 482 which neither proclaimed nor condemned Chalcedon.[10] Its goal was to find a common denominator for both groups. However, although it blurred the boundaries between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, it did not succeed in reconciling the two parties.[11]

[7] The deliberate vagueness of the charges against Dioscorus is pointed out by R. Price and M. Gaddis in their introduction to *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. i, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005, 45f.; and vol. iii, 29–116; see Chapter 2. That Dioscorus' deposition became an issue in the controversy over Chalcedon see Chapter 5.

[8] See *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. i, Price and Gaddis, 25–30.

[9] See E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5 (1950), 208–79.

[10] The text of the *Henoticon* can be found in Evagrius Scholasticus, *HE* III.14; *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London: Methuen 1898 [reprint Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert 1964], 111–14 (*The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, trans. Michael Whitby, TTH 33, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000, 147–9), but see also A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/1, Freiburg: Herder, 2nd edn. 1991, 285 n. 63.

[11] W. H. C. Frend, 'Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy', in *The Heritage of the Early Church*, ed. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, OCA 195, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1973, 266f.

On the contrary, it caused a schism between Rome and Constantinople, and brought forth in the East more or less extreme subgroups among the two parties. It is therefore sometimes difficult for the period from 482 to 518/19 to define Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. A moderate (Chalcedonian) patriarch like Flavian II of Antioch, who was later expelled by the insistence of the non-Chalcedonians Severus and Philoxenus, regarded Chalcedon as a disciplinary council only that condemned heretics but did not support the Chalcedonian formula of faith.[12]

Although all subsequent emperors tried to establish a union and urged bishops and patriarchs to come to an agreement, the Chalcedonian church historian Evagrius Scholasticus, who wrote at the end of the sixth century, was disillusioned about the state of the church at the time in which the *Henoticon* was enforced. He states that 'all churches were divided into distinct parties, and their prelates had no communion with each other'.[13] Emperors settled problems with patriarchs or bishops about faith or union from time to time in an opportune fashion.[14] The emperor who changed this policy of appeasement towards the divergent Christian groups in the East was Justin I (518–27). With Justin I the *Henoticon* was abandoned and replaced by a papal *libellus* which was quite different in its function. This *libellus* of Pope Hormisdas (514–23)—also called *Formula Hormisdae*—did not try to point out the tradition shared by the rival

[12] Flavian II was forced by the non-Chalcedonians to go so far as to regard Chalcedon as a disciplinary council only. Theophanes Confessor even noted that 'His accusers charged him [Flavian] for anathematizing the synod with his mouth only and not with his heart.' Theophanes Confessor, *Chronicle* AM 6004; *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. K. de Boor, Leizpig: Teubner 1883, 164 (*The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History* AD *284–813*, trans. and commentary C. Mango and R. Scott, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997, 237). However, in contrast to the ninth-century Theophanes, the sixth-century Chalcedonian church historian Evagrius Scholasticus did not know of Flavian's anathema; Evagrius, *HE* III.31, Bidez and Parmentier, 128f. (Whitby, 169–72). Maybe Theophanes' statement reflects that Byzantines wished even to punish non-visible dissident belief.

[13] Evagrius, *HE* III.30, Bidez and Parmentier, 126 (Whitby, 167). For Evagrius Scholasticus see P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 1981.

[14] Usually unruly bishops or patriarchs were exiled. Especially patriarchs in Constantinople like Euphemius and Macedonius felt the power of the emperor in the capital.

groups, but demanded the subjection of all groups to the faith of the apostolic see of Rome.[15]

The Chalcedonian policy that started with the enforcement of the *libellus* under Justin I and was continued by his nephew Justinian I (527–65) was responsible for the separation of the non-Chalcedonians. In order to historicize the split between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, this chapter will reassess Justin's involvement in this crucial period as well as the role of the papal *libellus*. Non-Chalcedonian chronicles remember the beginning of the reign of Justin as the start of persecutions and give a list of non-Chalcedonian bishops who were expelled.[16] However, a meticulous analysis of Paul the Jew's tenure as new Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (519–21) will demonstrate that the enforcement of Chalcedon and the expulsion of the non-Chalcedonian bishops was a rather slow process which lasted until 522. Furthermore, a discussion of the dispute over the so-called theopaschite formula will illuminate Justinian's first attempt in 519 to use this formula as a basis on which unification between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians might have been possible.

Although the non-Chalcedonian sources, especially the works of John of Ephesus, a non-Chalcedonian bishop, perceived the East as shattered by waves of violent persecutions, it seems that Justin I was as careful as his predecessors to find a balance between enforcing religious conformity and submitting to the reality of the religious landscape in the eastern provinces.[17] Nevertheless, the outcome of the emperor's policy against the non-Chalcedonians soon became

[15] For the *libellus* see W. Haacke, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma*, Rome: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae 1939; also A. Fortescue, *The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas*, Garrison, NY: National Office, Chair of Unity Octave 1955. See also below and Chapter 2.

[16] Even a careful scholar like Ernest Honigmann was deceived and dated the expulsions of non-Chalcedonian bishops in Osrhoene, with the exception of Paul of Edessa and John of Tella, to 519, which is very unlikely; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951, 50–4.

[17] As introductions see J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique*, Leuven: van Linthout 1909, 66ff.; A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1950, 221ff.; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972, 247ff.; J. A. S. Evans, *The Age of Justinian: The Circumstances of Imperial Power*, London and New York: Routledge 1996, 105ff.; see

evident: the enforcement of the papal *libellus* brought forth a sharp boundary—which had been blurred by the *Henoticon* before—between Chalcedonians who accepted the *libellus* and non-Chalcedonians who chose exile. As a result, a dispersed community of non-Chalcedonians took shape and established a church throughout the reigns of Justin and Justinian that would eventually be called the Syrian Orthodox Church.

JUSTIN I: A 'CONVINCED' CHALCEDONIAN?

Traditionally, Justin has been regarded as a 'convinced Chalcedonian'.[18] It is indicative that even a scholar like Vasiliev, who meticulously described Justin's religious policy, felt in no way compelled to explain why he thought that Justin was a convinced Chalcedonian. After his accession, Justin persecuted non-Chalcedonians, which presents proof enough for Vasiliev that Justin was a convinced Chalcedonian. However, this demonstrates that Justin sided with the Chalcedonians after his accession to the throne, not that he had been a persuaded Chalcedonian before coming to power. After Justin's accession, Justinian praised in a letter to the pope his uncle's 'most ardent zeal for the orthodox religion', and letters written by the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople referred in passing to Justin's work for the unity of the churches before he became emperor.[19] However, these very general and short flatteries for an

also S. Ashbrook Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and* The Lives of the Eastern Saints, Berkeley: University of California Press 1990. Short, but instructive is P. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden: Brill 1979, 44ff. A total religious unity could not have been Justin's goal as he did not enforce the *libellus* in Egypt, which became a safe harbour for expelled non-Chalcedonians.

[18] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 135; Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, vol. i, 268; Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/1, 359: 'Es darf supponiert werden, daß er schon vor seiner Erhebung zum Herrscher Anhänger des Konzils war.'

[19] *Collectio Avellana* 147; *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, vol. ii, ed. Otto Guenther, CSEL 35.2, Prague and Vienna: F. Tempsky 1898, 592f.: a letter by Justinian to Hormisdas, written 7 September 518; see K. Rosen, 'Iustinus I (Kaiser)', *RAC* 19 (2001), 766; *Coll. Avell.* 149: Hormisdas to Justin, end of January 519; *Coll. Avell.* 183: patriarch John to Hormisdas, 19 January 520. Also Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's statement

emperor who had by then chosen his side can hardly be taken at face value.[20]

Justin and his nephew Justinian were Illyrians, probably from a peasant background, and came from Bederiana in the Latin-speaking backwater province of Dardania.[21] It is always implied in accounts of Justin's alleged Chalcedonianism that his Illyrian origins—regarded as 'western origins'—made him inclined to Chalcedon. As the Balkans had been devastated by invasions of Huns since 447—even the metropolis of Dardania could not withstand a barbarian attack—many people from the Balkans tried to escape the subsequent rural poverty. Like other young men, Justin came to Constantinople probably around 470 when he was twenty years old, and joined the army. The sources agree that he received no education, and it is not even clear if his home, Bederiana, not more than a fortress according to Procopius, had the money to support a priest.[22] It seems likely that prior to his arrival at the capital his only exposure to Christianity might have been baptism.

It was no accident that he took the route to Constantinople: since Rome was far away and ruled by the Ostrogoths, Constantinople loomed for men like Justin as the centre of the world. Here, he was

that Justin 'because he shared the opinions of the inhabitants of Rome, [...] gave strict orders that the Synod and the Tome of Leo should be proclaimed' is hardly enough to assume Chalcedonianism on the side of Justin before his accession to the throne. See Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.1, *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, vol. ii, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 84, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1921, 61 (trans. *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, vol. iv, trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 88, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1924, 42; *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, London: Methuen & Co. 1899, 190).

[20] Cautious is E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, ABAW.PH, n.f. 10, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1934, 259. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums. Von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, vol. ii, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1933, 154f., remarks to letter 149: 'Der Brief streute [...] dem Kaiser reichlich Weihrauch.' In his letter to the pope, the patriarch points out that the pious emperor always worked for the unity of the churches whereas the papal *libellus* (or better: the problem of its implementation) would prevent a unity; see below and Chapter 2.

[21] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 43–63; Procopius, *Anecdota* VI.2, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 290, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1935, 68f.

[22] Procopius, *Buildings* IV.i.17–28; ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 343, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1940, 224–7.

socialized and lived for almost fifty years before donning the purple robe. Almost everything he became was shaped by that city, and his loyalty and first priority as emperor was likely to be with Constantinople and the east Roman empire.

However, Illyrians in Constantinople had a strong sense of their origins, as did other groups in Constantinople; this also included, in the case of the Illyrians, a positive attitude towards the papacy as can be seen in the *Chronicle* of the Illyrian Count Marcellinus, who lived in Constantinople and was Justinian's *cancellarius* before Justinian became emperor.[23] Marcellinus wrote his short *Chronicle* in 519 covering the period 379–518, and updated it in 534, and an anonymous writer filled in events until 548.[24] The *Chronicle*, directed towards an Illyrian audience in Constantinople, reveals a strong Illyrian identity. Although these Illyrians may have stayed in Constantinople longer than in their *patria* Illyria, Marcellinus probably shared with other Illyrians an enduring attachment to the West—most visible in his use of Latin and in his interest and sympathy for the papacy rather than showing concern for the succession of the patriarchs of Constantinople.[25]

Nevertheless, Justin's—and Justinian's—origins can hardly be counted as strong evidence for an alleged Chalcedonian persuasion.[26] In his fine analysis of Count Marcellinus, Brian Croke remarks that Illyrian generals at this time 'not only led armies but were informed and involved in theological and religious policy at the highest level.'[27]

[23] B. Croke, *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001, 17ff.

[24] Edited by Mommsen in *MGH*, now reprinted and translated in *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, ed. and trans. B. Croke, Byzantina Australiensia 7, Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies 1995.

[25] Croke, *Count Marcellinus*, 98.

[26] Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/1, 359, makes a comparison with Anastasius and says somewhat obscurely about Justin: 'Als Illyrer mit lateinischer Muttersprache hatte er, wie auch seine Frau, die neue Kaiserin Euphemia, gewisse günstige Voraussetzungen für die Verbindung mit Westrom, die aber nicht zwingend waren.' Anastasius' family, also of western, but of less backwater origin than Justin's, was divided over Chalcedon; see Al. Cameron, 'The House of Anastasius', *GBRS* 19 (1978), 259–76; P. Peeters, 'Hypatius et Vitalien. Autour de la succession de l'empereur Anastase', *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 10 (1950), 5–51; and G. Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius: *Quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum*: An Investigation of His Career', *Byz.* 66 (1996), 120–42.

[27] Croke, *Count Marcellinus*, 100.

This should, however, not lead to the conclusion that they displayed a strong conviction on either side. On the contrary, Geoffrey Greatrex has demonstrated the suppleness of these generals in theological matters—or the difficulties scholars face today in attempting to classify them as either Chalcedonians or non-Chalcedonians: Patricius seems to have been very flexible; so was Celer.[28] Apion changed from the non-Chalcedonian to the Chalcedonian party; Hypatius seems to have switched sides as well. The infamous general Vitalian, who led his troops against Constantinople several times, may have used Chalcedonianism for his own ends in order to revolt against the emperor Anastasius (491–518) who favoured the non-Chalcedonians.[29] Despite these cautions, Greatrex concludes that 'Justin's commitment to the Council was total' and '[m]en such as Patricius, Probus and Hypatius, on the other hand, could not compete with Justin for the loyalty of supporters of the Council.'[30]

However, this means reading the post-518 events backwards. The only information known about Justin before 518 is that troops were entrusted to him to defend Constantinople against Vitalian—probably together with the non-Chalcedonian former praetorian prefect Marinus.[31] Greatrex regards this as a sign that the non-Chalcedonian emperor Anastasius entrusted troops to a convinced Chalcedonian, Justin, to fight a Chalcedonian attack on the city.[32] Although this is certainly possible, it is a conclusion drawn *ex eventu*—taking into account Justin's measures after 518.

It seems more likely that Justin could make a career under a non-Chalcedonian emperor and be entrusted with troops to defend the city because he was either inclined to the faith of the emperor or presented himself as indifferent to the religious controversies—as

[28] Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius', 126f.

[29] For Vitalian see below; if he was a convinced Chalcedonian, his fate (being killed by Justin in 520) is tragic. If, however, his Chalcedonianism was a pretext for a potential accession to the throne, it was only consequent that Justin, ruling as a Chalcedonian emperor, eliminated the ambitious general. Already E. Schwartz, 'Über die Reichskonzilien von Theodosius bis Justinian', *ZSRG.K* 11 (1921), 243, believed that it was not the dogmatic issue which caused his rebellion, but 'Pläne, die weiter, bis zu kühner Höhe hinauf flogen.'

[30] Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius', 138.

[31] Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius', 135.

[32] Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius', 137.

much as this might have been possible at this time. The latter is certainly more likely, but having lived in Constantinople for so long, he may have been influenced by either religious point of view.[33] In conclusion, the sources do not support the image of Justin as a convinced Chalcedonian before 518.

JUSTIN I: A CHALCEDONIAN EMPEROR

Although in 518 the emperor Anastasius died at the age of ninety he seems to have made no arrangements for succession.[34] Scholars have assumed that around 516 'the tide had already turned against the opponents of Chalcedon',[35] and everyone in Constantinople sat waiting for Anastasius' death in order to crown a new Chalcedonian emperor.[36] It is true that Vitalian's Chalcedonian policy was supported in the Balkans from 513; supposedly 10,000 monks rallied for Chalcedon in Jerusalem in 516; and in 518 crowds of people hailed the new emperor and the Council of Chalcedon after Justin's accession.

However, Anastasius did not rule Constantinople with non-Chalcedonian inclinations against the will of the whole city. Although

[33] This might even include a pre-Chalcedonian perception on Christology because 'Arianism' was still strong among the military at the beginning of the sixth century (and it remained the official faith of the Ostrogoths, who ruled Italy). However, as emperor Justin was strictly opposed to this doctrine; see G. Greatrex, 'Justin I and the Arians', *PatrSt* 34 (2001), 72–81.

[34] John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVI.22; *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000, 225 (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986, 229); *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn: Ed. Weber 1832, 611 (*Chronicon Paschale 284–628* AD, trans. Michael and Mary Whitby, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1989, 103). He did not have any children of his own, but three nephews, Probus, Pompeius, and Hypatius.

[35] Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius', 137.

[36] Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 239: 'The Byzantine world was ripe for a reconsideration of Chalcedon on its own merits' following L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VIème siècle*, Paris: E. de Boccard, Successeur 1925, 45, in his judgement that the election of Justin happened on religious grounds because everyone in Constantinople was fed up with the 'fanatisme monophysite'.

a majority in the city may have been Chalcedonian,[37] the city and its Chalcedonian elements did not rebel against the emperor when the *comes* Vitalian marched against the city several times between 513 and 517 under the pretext that Anastasius was not orthodox, i.e. not Chalcedonian. High-ranking non-Chalcedonian officials are known from the time of Anastasius from Severus' letters, and Severus himself hoped for a non-Chalcedonian future right at this time when some scholars see the tide turning against the non-Chalcedonians.[38] As late as 533 a huge crowd demanded after an earthquake in Constantinople that the emperor should burn the decrees of Chalcedon.[39] Schwartz makes an insightful claim when he states that there may have been a political opposition in Constantinople against the increasing influence of Severus on the emperor.[40] That might have caused hesitation in 518 among the nobility to crown another non-Chalcedonian emperor for fear that this could strengthen Severus' influence.

When the officials met in the morning after Anastasius' death, the *demos* demanded an 'emperor, given by God, to the world'.[41] Nothing indicates that they demanded a Chalcedonian emperor—

[37] See Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 46.

[38] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 41, Brooks, 307: 'Since then at the present time some common agreement among the churches is hoped for, do not lower your mind to untimely hair-splitting.' The letter is dated by Brooks to 516–17.

[39] Even if it were not the 'entire people' as the *Chronicon Paschale* has it, enough people came that the Chalcedonian author of this chronicle felt compelled to mention it: *Chronicon Paschale*, Dindorf, 629 (Whitby and Whitby, 128). See M. Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 2003, 357f. Throughout the Nika revolt people in Constantinople did not hesitate to ask the non-Chalcedonian nephew of Anastasius, Probus, to become emperor; see Greatrex, 'Flavius Hypatius'; *idem*, 'The Nika Revolt: A Reappraisal', *JHS* 117 (1997), 60–86; and M. Meier 'Die Inszenierung einer Katastrophe: Justinian und der Nika-Aufstand', *ZPE* 142 (2003), 273–300. Furthermore the patriarch Anthimus (535/6) became non-Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian priest Zooras seemed to have been greatly successful in baptizing children of the Constantinopolitan nobility in the first half of the 530s; see J. Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *OstKSt* 43 (1994), 114, and Chapter 5.

[40] Schwartz, 'Über die Reichskonzilien von Theodosius bis Justinian', 243.

[41] Constantine Porphyrogennetus, *De Cerimoniis* I.93, in *PG* 112, 788–93 (quoted from Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 70). *De Cerimoniis* incorporates in I.84–95 the work of Peter the Patrician from the sixth century. See J. B. Bury, 'The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos', *EHR* 22 (1907), 209–27 and 417–39, especially 212f. See also G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le « césaropapisme » byzantin*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard 1996, 74–105.

not surprisingly, as it seems that the likeliest candidate was a non-Chalcedonian. The sources agree that Amantius, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, a powerful non-Chalcedonian eunuch with whom Severus was on good terms, had planned to place the *domesticus* Theocritus on the throne.[42] Amantius gave Justin, the *comes* of the excubitors, money in order to bribe the army and maybe other people, but the sources are divided on whether Justin carried out the plan or used the money to further his own career.[43] Even without being a 'cynic', an unbiased observer might expect that Justin appropriated the money for his own election: it is difficult to imagine that Justin had made such a brilliant career at court by remaining a naive and innocent peasant.[44]

[42] See Severus' letter to Amantius; Severus, *Collection of Letters* 51, Brooks, 325f. The sixth-century accounts (John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.2, Thurn, 337 (Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott, 230f.); *Chronicle of Marcellinus*, 519, Croke, 41; Evagrius, *HE* IV.2, Bidez and Parmentier, 153f. (Whitby, 200f.); Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.1, Brooks, 61 (Brooks, 42; Hamilton and Brooks, 189f.); and also *Chronicon Paschale* 519, Dindorf, 611f. (Whitby and Whitby, 103f.); and Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6011, de Boor, 165f. (Mango and Scott, 249f.)) agree that Amantius—who could not strive for emperorship himself because he was a eunuch—intrigued on behalf of the *domesticus*, but his candidate did not play a role among the candidates put forward in *de Cerimoniis*; that this might have been a deliberate omission see Whitby's translation of Evagrius, 201 n. 4; for Amantius in general *PLRE II*, Amantius 4, 67f. Against this view see now G. Greatrex, 'The Early Years of Justin I's Reign in the Sources', *Electrum* 12 (2007), 99–113 (I am grateful that the author supplied me with an offprint), who argues that Amantius' conspiracy might have been a fabrication—spread by Justin as justification for the brutal murdering of Amantius. The fact that Amantius tried to bribe Justin (see below) was invented as well in order to discredit Amantius further. Greatrex, however, does not lay out how this alleged fabrication could be accepted as standard tradition and why Amantius' bribery should have discredited only the eunuch, but not Justin (who accepted the bribery) as well.

[43] John Malalas—and following him the *Chronicon Paschale*—states that he distributed the money as asked, but Eugarius is uncertain if he distributed it or used it to secure his own election. Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.1, Brooks, 61 (Brooks, 42; Hamilton and Brooks, 190) records that 'he by giving the gold to these men gained their favour, and they made him king, because the Lord willed it'.

[44] M. Anastos, '*Vox Populi Voluntas Dei* and the Election of the Byzantine Emperor', in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, part 2: *Early Christianity*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12, Leiden: Brill 1975, 188 believes that 'cynics might well take this to mean that Justin had misappropriated the money given to him by Amantius and used it to bribe the election in his favor'.

Be this as it may, Justin was at the very least regarded as a trustworthy aid in the eyes of a steadfast non-Chalcedonian like Amantius who attempted to secure the election to the throne for his confidant. It is therefore unlikely that Justin was known as an outspoken Chalcedonian at this point.[45] According to *de Cerimoniis*—which for this part is based on a sixth-century account—the high officials agreed upon Justin after long discussions and after several candidates before him had not been accepted by either the excubitors or the factions. Justin was crowned in the Hippodrome on 10 July 518.[46]

His election, however, placed him immediately in opposition to Amantius and the non-Chalcedonian party at court. Justin was now limited in his decisions and choices by both friends and especially foes. Regardless of whether or not Justin had distributed the money as Amantius had required, Amantius and his friends at court became now immediate and dangerous enemies.[47] Justin was therefore confronted on the one hand with Amantius who was connected to the non-Chalcedonian network of Severus, and on the other with the Chalcedonian Goth Vitalian who still headed an army in Thrace.[48] Vitalian was an experienced military leader and certainly willing to lead his army again against Constantinople if Justin denounced Chalcedon—a nightmare for an old man who had just ascended the throne. It is therefore safe to say that Justin had most to gain politically by siding with the Chalcedonians. All that remained for him was to strengthen Chalcedonian partisans, who for their part were eager to support the new emperor if he made their agenda his priority.

[45] Justin also did not mention any intention for a religious change in his short inauguration speech; Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *De Cerimoniis*, I.93 (*PG* 112, 792f.); Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 72. However, the coronation process may have been too ritualized to expect any political statements here.

[46] 'Un peu par hasard' as Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre*, 80 (see also 88f.) points out.

[47] It is of course difficult to judge if Amantius represented *the* or even *a* non-Chalcedonian faction at court, and if divisions in general were drawn only by religious boundaries. However, as quarrels over Chalcedon had and still stirred up riots and rebellions, and as Amantius was on good terms with Severus, it can be assumed that Amantius represented some kind of non-Chalcedonian group at court.

[48] See also Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 46.

Chalcedonians had already demonstrated their discontent with Anastasius' non-Chalcedonian policy during his rule. Severus, the non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, referred in a letter of 518 to recent events in Constantinople:

> on New Sunday so great an assembly of orthodox was purposely collected that those who were collected by a gleaning process by the heretics did not dare even to appear, but only to slink away and hide, and they were in great fear, and by flight gained freedom from all harm.[49]

Here, shortly after the election of John, the new patriarch of Constantinople, in April 518, the non-Chalcedonians were still favoured by the late Anastasius. The ninth-century chronicler Theophanes the Confessor records that 'the congregation stirred up a great disturbance to make John anathematize Severus'.[50] This was apparently unsuccessful, although 'certain men, in number very few' tried to spread rumour that the new patriarch of Constantinople had done so.[51] That such an undertaking was risky is again attested by Severus, who announced with satisfaction to his letter's addressee that these men were arrested.

After the death of Anastasius, presumably the same Chalecedonian groups lobbied again for their case and demonstrated strength. The Chalcedonian crowd was not naive, but aware of the fact that Justin had become emperor against Amantius.[52] Records by a contemporary author—probably an eyewitness—give a detailed account of the religious services held in St Sophia on the Sunday and Monday after

[49] Severus, *Select Letters* VI.1, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus*, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, Williams & Norgate: London 1902, 408/9 (362).

[50] Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6010, de Boor, 164 (*Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, Mango and Scott, 248).

[51] Severus, *Select Letters* VI.1, Brooks, 408 (362). Of course Severus may downplay the number of unhappy Chalcedonians. It would be interesting to know if Vitalian was involved in these commotions.

[52] As they demonstrated by shouting: 'Throw out the new Tzumas! The new Tzumas is Amantius. Throw the braggart out of the palace!' *ACO* III, 74.33f. (Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 141). Chrysaphius Tzumas was the 'beloved' eunuch of Theodosius II and slain by his successor Marcian (John Malalas, *Chronicle* XIV.32, Thurn, 290 (E. and M. Jeffreys and Scott, 201)). The crowd compared the new emperor to Marcian, who had brought about the Council of Chalcedon, and thereby clearly positioned Justin in opposition to Amantius.

Justin became emperor.[53] When the patriarch John and other clergy entered the church for the usual service on 15 July, they were greeted by an excited and enraged congregation. John himself was not an obstacle for the Chalcedonians as he had adopted a 'deceitful middle course' according to Severus.[54] The crowd claimed the so far uncompromised patriarch for the Chalcedonian cause, to which John—faced with an unruly crowd—finally submitted.[55]

The crowd first forced John and the clergy to proclaim Chalcedon and anathematize Severus. The patriarch, however, insisted on consulting the emperor first before holding a commemoration service for the fathers of Chalcedon. When John complied and held the service a day later, the congregation went a step further and required him to inscribe Chalcedon and the former Chalcedonian patriarchs of Constantinople—Euphemius (490–6) and Macedonius (496–511)—and Pope Leo in the diptychs of the church.[56] Repeated shouts convey a good impression of how tense the situation was. John desperately, and in the end unsuccessfully, answered:

> You well know that we have by all means tried to satisfy you and not to offend you. But since it is necessary that everything should be done canonically and in good order, allow us to congregate the bishops beloved of God in order that everything may proceed according to the divine canons and through the order of our most pious emperor.[57]

But the Chalcedonian crowd locked the doors and forced the clergy present to do what they requested. Some scholars have seen in the

[53] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 136; for the following *ACO* III, 71–6; see Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 136–48.

[54] Severus had immediately been suspicious that John 'holds out some pleasing hopes to the orthodox, but is more desirous to adopt a deceitful middle course'; Severus, *Select Letters* VI.1, Brooks, 406f. (361). Severus probably expected John to adopt the model of his predecessor Timothy, who according to Theophanes had anathematized non-Chalcedonians when a Chalcedonian monk forced him to, but denied the matter in front of the emperor and anathematized Chalcedon; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6005, de Boor, 158 (Mango and Scott, 239f.).

[55] John of Ephesus presents John as submitting to the will of the empress; *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 16f. (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies: Toronto 1999, 49f.); see below.

[56] For the diptychs see Chapter 2.

[57] Quoted from Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 143.

public demonstrations of 15 and 16 July Justin's work rather than a spontaneous action.[58] Although this is possible, Chalcedonians had already lobbied against Severus and for Chalcedon before Justin became emperor. The Chalcedonians might therefore have acted here on their own account—maybe headed by extreme Chalcedonian monks—and presented the emperor with a *fait accompli.* The Chalcedonians perhaps thought that the church of Constantinople should become Chalcedonian before the emperor decided that the status quo would be best for the empire. Of course, as the patriarch had attempted to explain to the crowd, any decision needed to be confirmed by a council of bishops anyway, but it was always easier to confirm decisions than change and erase the names from the diptychs again. This was the first victory of the Chalcedonians even before the new emperor had been officially or publicly involved in any religious affairs.[59]

One of Justin's first actions in power was to slay Amantius and his supporters.[60] This must have happened between 16 July and 20 July,[61] the day on which a council was held in Constantinople in order to approve the changes made on 15 and 16 July.[62] The council confirmed that Euphemius and Macedonius, the former Chalcedonian

[58] K.-H. Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Aug.* 39 (1999), 8. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/1, 360, on the other hand regards these two meetings as spontaneous undertakings of the crowd (under the heading: 'Vox Populi—Vox Dei').

[59] M. Anastos, 'The Emperor Justin I's Role in the Restoration of Chalcedonian Doctrine, 518–519', in *Δώρημα στον* I. *Καραγιαννόπουλο* (=*Βυζαντινά* 13), Thessalonike 1985, 129, argues for the opposite as he believes that there is 'indisputable proof for the dominant role of the emperor in the definition of Christian dogma'.

[60] The non-Chalcedonian authors regard them as martyrs who died because they did not want to allow Justin to proclaim Chalcedon: Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.1, Brooks, 61f. (Brooks, 42; Brooks-Hamilton, 190); Jacob of Edessa, *Chronicle*, in *Chronica Minora*, vol. iii, CSCO 5, 6, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955, 317 (239); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.16; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901, 271 (180); see Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 106.

[61] 'Indeed, when he [Justin] had been not yet ten days in power, he slew Amantius, Director of the Palace eunuchs, together with certain men'; Procopius, *Anecdota* VI.26, Dewing, 76f.; however, Procopius' statement that Amantius was killed just because 'he had spoken some hasty words against [the patriarch] John' seems highly unlikely, but see also Greatrex, 'The Early Years of Justin I's Reign in the Sources', 102.

[62] *ACO* III, 62.

patriarchs of Constantinople, were to be restored to the diptychs, all clergy loyal to these two patriarchs should be recalled, Chalcedon as well as Leo be inscribed in the diptychs, and Severus be anathematized.[63]

In addition to the text of the council, two documents survive which were apparently addressed to the council. One is a *libellus* by the monks of Constantinople which petitioned for what the council decided later.[64] The other document, a petition addressed to the patriarch John and the council, was subscribed by Antiochene priests, monks, and others who charged Severus among other things with having slaughtered 350 monks.[65] As it can be assumed that this petition was presented to the council on 20 July, it is impossible that these Antiochene monks came directly from Antioch or brought this document from Antioch in time for the council which was assembled only ten days after the accession of Justin and not called for before 16 July.[66] It must therefore be supposed that some of the Antiochene monks and clergy, who were not content with Severus—either because of his non-Chalcedonianism or because of his charismatic and austere regime in Antioch—had travelled to Constantinople in the time of Anastasius, and had waited for an opportunity to bring up their discontent.[67] In the same way

[63] See Chapter 2.

[64] *ACO* III, 67–71. The 56 subscribers of this *libellus* might have been at the forefront among the congregation on 15 and 16 July.

[65] *ACO* III, 60–2; see *Coll. Avell.* 139; both texts as well as Hormisdas' letter to the archimandrites and monks in Syria II and another *libellus* by these archimandrites and monks to their own bishops are translated into German by H. Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998, 74–82. Suermann also defends their authenticity against previous assumptions that they might have been forgeries.

[66] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 147f.

[67] These unhappy Antiochenes could have been the 'heretics' mentioned in one of Severus' letters (*Select Letters* VI.1, Brooks, 408f. (362)) who had spread the rumour that John of Constantinople had anathematized Severus. They were probably the same or part of the group which had tried to accuse Severus in 517 before Anastasius of being responsible for a massacre in which 350 monks died, but Anastasius refused to talk to them; *Coll. Avell.* 139. Among the Antiochene monks might have been the successor of Severus, the future Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Paul the Jew, as one of the subscribers is a certain monk Paul (*ACO* III, 62). That would mean that some of these Antiochene monks had been in Constantinople for years. However, Paul is a very common name, and there is no further indication for identification.

non-Chalcedonians lingered in Constantinople in the reign of Justinian, waiting for their chance that Justinian would listen to their concern about his religious policy.

After the council, the church of Constantinople became officially Chalcedonian, and Justin attempted to make peace with Vitalian. The recall and invitation of the Gothic general to Constantinople was a necessity because Vitalian and his army still posed a major threat to the capital. Vitalian *nolens volens* accepted, but later, after he had become influential in Constantinople, was assassinated by Justin—and by Justinian whom scholars believe to have been behind most moves of Justin—in July 520.[68]

In review, there is no reason to believe that Justin had been a Chalcedonian by persuasion before he was crowned emperor. However, plenty of evidence suggests that he found it advantageous to become a Chalcedonian. He did not appear to have been the obvious candidate for the throne, but he seized his chance when the opportunity arose. His first priority must have been to secure the throne by crushing the opposition around Amantius, neutralizing the power of Vitalian, and strengthening the elements that supported him. By siding with the Chalcedonians Justin achieved all these goals. Therefore, the rapid sequence of events after his election and the prompt decision for Chalcedon should not lead to the assumption that Justin was a 'convinced Chalcedonian'. Instead, his weakness as a candidate and the strong threats from two opposing sides dictated his decisions and forced him to look for allies among the Chalcedonians. This may have coincided with a personal pro-Chalcedonian leaning, but the evidence suggests that Justin became a Chalcedonian emperor for *raisons d'état*.[69]

[68] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 110–13, 200: after 10 July 520 when the papal legates had left; *PLRE*, Vitalianus 2, 1176; Greatrex, 'The Early Years of Justin I's Reign in the Sources', 105f.

[69] The non-Chalcedonian John of Ephesus credits Justin's wife with a genuine Chalcedonian conviction, but otherwise blames Justin's advisers for the change in the religious policy. It seems, however, questionable how well he knew the events in Constantinople. That Justin's wife alone was responsible for the inscription of Chalcedon into the diptychs is difficult to reconcile with the Chalcedonian accounts; see *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 16f. (Harrak, 49f.).

THE UNION WITH ROME IN 519

It is worth reflecting on the options available to the new emperor after enforcing Chalcedon in Constantinople. The patriarchate of Constantinople had traditionally adhered to Chalcedon before 512 although the Chalcedonian patriarchs of Constantinople had not been recognized by Rome since the *Henoticon* in 482. Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople 511–18, had performed a difficult balancing act in order to satisfy the Chalcedonian monks in Constantinople on the one hand and the emperor Anastasius on the other.[70] Having sided with the Chalcedonians, it was in the interest of Justin—and maybe in compliance to a demand by Vitalian, who had requested a council between Rome and the East for 515 when Anastasius was still ruling[71]—to restore communion with Rome. Although geographically distant and in the past decades often left out from developments in the East, Rome's prestige was high among Chalcedonians in the East.[72] The schism after the *Henoticon* was not undisputed in the East, and Chalcedonians in the East who had not received satisfactory answers to enquiries in Constantinople, had bypassed the capital and communicated with the pope.[73] To be backed by Rome was crucial for any Chalcedonian emperor, and a reunion with the pope could give Justin's reign more legitimacy and put him in a stronger position.[74]

[70] See Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6005, de Boor, 157–60 (Mango and Scott, 238–41).

[71] Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6006, de Boor 160f. (Mango and Scott, 243); *Coll. Avell.* 109.

[72] See F. K. Haarer, *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, ARCA 46, Cambridge: Francis Cairns 2006, 162.

[73] Syrian monks had not only complained about Severus at Anastasius' court, but also wrote to Pope Hormisdas; see Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlung*, 256f.; two villages sent a delegation to the 'west'—which probably means Rome—to receive ordinations; Severus, *Select Letters* I.6, Brooks, 42f. (38f.), but see also Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlung*, 256 n. 1.

[74] One reason why Anastasius moved further to the non-Chalcedonian side throughout his reign might have been because he could not come to an agreement with the papacy. To reign as a Chalcedonian emperor without Rome—which had played an important but also disruptive part at the Council of Chalcedon—seems to have been almost impossible in the fifth and sixth centuries.

On 1 August Justin sent a letter to the pope announcing his election, thereby opening communication between Rome and Constantinople, which culminated in a formal agreement of communion on 28 March 519.[75] John, the patriarch of Constantinople, was practically forced by the emperor to accept the papal *libellus*. This document laid the foundation for the final separation of the non-Chalcedonians as it defined on which terms Chalcedon should be enforced in the East. It demanded among other things that the non-Chalcedonian and Chalcedonian patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria after 482 needed to be condemned because they had accepted the *Henoticon* and had therefore not been in communion with Rome. By signing the *libellus*, John condemned his former *syncellus* and predecessor Timothy and all other patriarchs since 482.[76] The names of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs Acacius, Fravita, Euphemius, Macedonius, and Timothy, and the names of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius were erased from the diptychs of the churches in Constantinople.[77] However, as Euphemius and Macedonius had just been reinscribed in the diptychs in July 518 on demand of the Chalcedonian crowd, the re-erasure was done without a public celebration.[78]

It was not difficult for the emperor to enforce the *libellus* in Constantinople, but John's unwillingness (which certainly reflected the mood of the whole Constantinopolitan clergy) to comply with the emperor's will should have made the emperor aware of the potential explosive force of the *libellus*. Justin could have anticipated that in other cities in the East the requirement to condemn non-Chalcedonian bishops as well as Chalcedonian bishops—some of them, such as Euphemius and Macedonius, regarded as martyrs for

[75] *Coll. Avell.* 141; for the following see E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, vol. ii, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1933, 149–81 and Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 160–97; for questions concerning the chronology: O. Günther, 'Beiträge zur Chronologie der Briefe des Papstes Hormisda', in *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 162.XI, Vienna: F. Tempsky 1892.

[76] *Coll. Avell.* 160; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 156–9.

[77] *Coll. Avell.* 167.

[78] See Pope Hormisdas' instructions for his legates (*Coll. Avell.* 158): if it would be impossible to publicly anathematize the successors of Acacius, then the legates were allowed to limit their demand to the tacit erasure of the patriarchs from the diptychs. Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 153 and 159.

the Chalcedonian case—would bring forth strong and stubborn resistance by the respective bishops.

Whereas in Constantinople the crowd enjoyed the newly established communion and, according to the papal legates, gathered in greater numbers than ever before,[79] problems concerning the enforcement of the *libellus* elsewhere soon reached Constantinople. In the autumn of 519 the metropolitan Dorotheus of Thessalonica sent so much money to Constantinople that, according to a papal delegate, it 'could even blind angels'.[80] It was probably sent in order to instigate opposition against the *libellus*.[81] Dorotheus also caused a bloody incident in Thessalonica in which a bishop sent by the pope was severely wounded and some servants died.[82] The pope demanded Dorotheus' exile or his appearance in Rome, but after a short investigation and confinement, Dorotheus was back in office.[83] However, Dorotheus also had opponents among the bishops in the Balkans, and it is likely that the enforcement of the *libellus* went here in general rather smoothly.[84]

Justin needed to take into consideration what he could realistically push through, and therefore the enforcement of the *libellus* took longer than the pope might have wished. The emperor seemed hesitant or unable to exile non-Chalcedonian bishops who did not consent to the *libellus* immediately. In a letter to the pope from 29 June 519, one of the legates complained about the Council of Chalcedon having still not been accepted in Ephesus.[85] A letter by Severus

[79] *Coll. Avell.* 167; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 156; Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 178.

[80] *Coll. Avell.* 186.

[81] Dorotheus had sided with Constantinople in the schism between Rome and Constantinople. He probably wrote already in 513 a letter to the pope in which he defended the *Henoticon* and demanded that the pope support the bishops who adhered to the *Henoticon* and not to condemn them (Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlung*, 300–3). However, see also Haarer, *Anastasius I*, 163f.

[82] *Coll. Avell.* 186 and 225. Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 165–9.

[83] All eastern bishops had to subscribe to Hormisdas' *libellus* and return it to the pope. However, in October 520, more than a year after this incident, the pope still had not received Dorotheus' signed *libellus*, and no evidence survives he ever did; for Hormisdas' *libellus* see Chapter 2.

[84] For opponents of Dorotheus see Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6008, de Boor, 162 (Mango and Scott, 246). The pope was proud that signed *libelli* arrived daily, but unfortunately it is unknown where they came from; Haacke, *Glaubensformel*, 83.

[85] *Coll. Avell.* 216. Maybe after the complaints the metropolitan Theosebius of Ephesus was compelled to come to Constantinople and accept Chalcedon; see *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 18 (Harrak, 51).

of Antioch, probably written in 519 or 520, demonstrates that the non-Chalcedonian bishops Proclus of Coloneia and Eusebuna (bishopric unknown) in Cappadocia still held their offices.[86] Proclus was later exiled as a non-Chalcedonian, but the fate of Eusebuna is unknown.[87]

SOTERICHUS AND THEOPASCHISM

Not only the non-Chalcedonians posed a problem for the new emperor, but also the Chalcedonians. First, at the very beginning of his reign, Justin had to deal with Chalcedonian bishops who were exiled under Anastasius for unclear reasons.[88] Second, he was confronted with a trend among Chalcedonians called conventionally 'theopaschism' which formed part of the 'neo-Chalcedonian' tradition. Neo-Chalcedonianism, a sixth-century phenomenon, developed a Christology based on Cyril which aimed to defend Chalcedon against non-Chalcedonians who also claimed to be the heirs of the Cyrillian legacy.[89] The theopaschites favoured the formula 'one of the Trinity was crucified' (*unus ex Trinitate crucifixus*) which was not universally accepted among Chalcedonians and challenged Justin (and Justinian) early in his reign.

Both problems—the reinstatement of the exiled bishops as well as the issue of theopaschism—are linked in the sources with the city of Caesarea, but the question of which Caesarea is meant, and the involvement of their respective bishops (especially of Soterichus) in the theological debate will be laid out here.

At the beginning of Justin's reign expelled bishops were recalled—as already Vitalian had demanded—but three of them, Thomas,

[86] Severus, *Select Letters* V.13, Brooks, 387 (344); Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 110.

[87] Therefore it is likely that he accepted the *libellus* and stayed in office.

[88] It is difficult to detect any theological issues that could have caused the expulsions: later Pope Hormisdas only spoke of an 'error of disunity'; *Coll. Avell.* 204. See also Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6005, de Boor, 157 (Mango and Scott, 239 with n. 7).

[89] For a brief introduction see P. Gray, 'Neuchalkedonismus', *TRE* 24 (1994), 289–96, but see also literature below.

Nicostratus, and Elias, were still not reinstated in the summer of 519 because their sees were occupied. Where Thomas and Nicostratus had formerly been bishops is not known, but Elias had been bishop of Caesarea, and some scholars believe that this refers to Caesarea in Cappadocia.[90] A bishop called Soterichus occupied the metropolitan see of Caesarea in Cappadocia from probably 510/11 until 537.[91] No writings by him survive, but since 511—when he and Philoxenus presided over the Council of Side—he was a major player in the church politics of the East, and scholars seem to have underestimated his importance in these years.[92] Soterichus held a council some time between 513 and 518 with bishops of Cappadocia, Pontus, and Galatia and condemned a regional heresy.[93] In 516, in turn, he himself was condemned by the Chalcedonians in Jerusalem along with Nestorius, Eutyches, and Severus.[94] The Chalcedonians ranked him among their archvillains, even above Philoxenus, the metropolitan of Mabbug, who is generally regarded as a fierce non-Chalcedonian. That Soterichus demanded a say in non-Chalcedonian matters is supported by a letter written by Severus to the metropolitan of Cappadocia in reply to an accusation by Soterichus. The metropolitan apparently had accused the patriarch saying that Severus' oblation would not be pure 'on account of the names of those who

[90] For a discussion of the older literature see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 109–13. Other exiled bishops returned to their sees: John of Paltos in Syria I, Severianus of Arethusa and Eusebius of Larissa in Syria II; see R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche. Depuis la paix de l'Eglise jusqu'à la conquète arabe*, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre 1945, 170, 182, 183. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 30, 64f. (Severianus of Arethusa and Eusebius of Larissa were already back in office in August 518); Marcellinus *comes* states that Justin recalled John of Paltos; see *Chronicle of Marcellinus* 512, Croke, 37.

[91] He appears first in 510/11 in Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6003, de Boor, 153f. (Mango and Scott, 234) and Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Sabas*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1939, 141 (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. R. M. Price, CS 114, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1991, 151). For Soterichus see E. Honigmann, 'Heraclianus of Chalcedon (537 A.D.?), Soterichus of Caesarea in Cappadocia and Achillius', in *idem*, *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1953, 205–16.

[92] Although non-Chalcedonians presided at the Council of Sidon, it nevertheless became a victory for Flavian II of Antioch and the Chalcedonians.

[93] The so-called Adelphians who are otherwise unknown; Severus, *Select Letters* I.13, Brooks, 61 (55).

[94] Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Sabas*, Schwartz, 151 (Price, 161) and Theophanes *Chronicle* AM 6005, de Boor, 158f. (Mango and Scott, 240).

have already died, and who have fallen into heretical tenets, and have not been removed from the sacred tablets [=diptychs]'.[95]

Therefore it is surprising that Soterichus did not appear in the list of expelled non-Chalcedonian bishops after 518. Perhaps the fact that he was not on good terms, indeed not even in communion, with Severus, the main target of the Chalcedonians, paid off for him.[96] In addition to this, he might have lobbied for his case in Constantinople, in order to stay in office. He was well travelled: it is said that he went to Philoxenus, presided over the council at Side, and was on his way to Constantinople when Timothy died and John became the new patriarch of Constantinople in April 518.[97]

If the exiled bishop Elias really had been the metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia, that would mean that Soterichus became the successor of Elias probably around 510/11 according to the Byzantine chronicler Theophanes. This is, however, unlikely, as Theophanes does not mention any expulsion of Soterichus' predecessor.[98] The nineteenth-century German scholar Diekamp considered it in general unlikely that a Chalcedonian bishop had to leave his see before 511/12 when the Chalcedonian patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch were expelled. Instead, he points to a bishop Elias of Caesarea in Palestine in 536 who may have been the same Elias who had been expelled decades earlier.[99]

Elias and the other two bishops were probably not recalled from exile before the end of 518 after the agreement with Vitalian. As their sees were occupied, they probably assembled in Constantinople hoping to find a receptive ear at court for their case. The court's decision not to reinstate them must have been reached in the summer of 519. Pope Hormisdas first asked the emperor to reinstate the

[95] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 45, Brooks, 333f.

[96] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 46, Brooks, 334–8; and *Select Letters* IV.3, Brooks, 291 (258).

[97] Severus, *Select Letters* IV.3, Brooks, 291 (258).

[98] Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6003, de Boor, 153 (Mango and Scott, 234).

[99] Already A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, vol. i, Braunschweig: E. Peter 1867, 915 n. 2, and F. Diekamp, 'Das Zeitalter des Erzbischofs Andreas von Cäsarea', *HJ* 18 (1897), 4–7. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 112, points out that there is a Nicostratus of Abila in Palestine in 536, and considering the fact that Nicostratus is not a very common name, it could be the exiled Chalcedonian bishop mentioned above. This might indicate that all bishops came from Palestine.

bishops on 2 September 519, and it can be assumed that he responded to an appeal by these three bishops.[100] In other words, they wrote their petition to the pope towards the end of July or in August 519 after they unsuccessfully attempted to get imperial approval for a reinstatement. Justin did not answer the pope before June 520, and told him that because of the popularity of the present bishop of Caesarea among the citizens and the whole East, Elias could not be reinstated until the present bishop died.[101]

It is hard to reconcile this information with Soterichus who—accepting Chalcedon before 512, condemning it afterwards and apparently accepting it again in 518—could hardly have been praised as very popular by the emperor in a letter to the pope.[102] However, already the pope's letter of 2 September seems suspicious as Hormisdas did not mention Soterichus at all, neither his non-Chalcedonian activities nor his condemnation by Chalcedonians. If Elias had been bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia and the pope wanted to have him reinstated, it seems that the pope's argument should have been to point out that the present bishop was or had been a high-profile heretic. On the other hand we know that the bishop of Caesarea in Palestine at this time—John the Chozibite—was very popular,[103] and therefore there is no reason to doubt that the expelled Elias had been bishop of Caesarea in Palestine.

These two Caesareas, one in Cappadocia and one in Palestine, again play a role when scholars try to locate the origins of neo-Chalcedonian Christology at this time—a discussion which in turn may be important for Soterichus' theological development as will be shown below. Caesarea was the home of a so-called John the

[100] Hormisdas sent several letters to Constantinople including one to the three bishops (*Coll. Avell.* 210); see also *Coll. Avell.* 202, 203, 207, and 211.

[101] *Coll. Avell.* 193.

[102] Furthermore, the term 'Oriens' used in the letter can hardly apply here to Cappadocia, but must refer to Palestine. Cf. another letter of Justin to Hormisdas (*Coll. Avell.* 232), where he refers to Pontic, Asian, and eastern ('Orientales') churches which refused to accept the *libellus*: here 'Orientales' refers to the churches in the provinces of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem.

[103] Evagrius, *HE* IV.7, Bidez-Parmentier, 157–9 (Whitby, 206f.) has him performing a miracle, but also John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow* 25, ed. Migne in *PG* 87.3, 2869–72 (John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. J. Wortley, CS 139, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1992, 17) and Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Sabas* 61, Schwartz, 162 (Price, 172) mention him.

Grammarian who was one of the first neo-Chalcedonian theologians and a key figure for the neo-Chalcedonians in the sixth century.[104] John wrote an apology for the Council of Chalcedon between 514 and 518 to which Severus of Antioch responded with a long refutation.[105] John is said to have lived in Caesarea, but the sources do not specify which Caesarea is meant. Although neo-Chalcedonianism grew stronger in Palestine, there is a tendency among scholars to locate John the Grammarian in Caesarea in Cappadocia.[106]

A group among these neo-Chalcedonians favoured the theopaschite formula 'one of the Trinity was crucified' (*unus ex Trinitate*

[104] See Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 23f. The so-called neo-Chalcedonian theology has long been studied: Lebon, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien*, 119–23, 147–63; V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der 'skythischen Kontroversen'*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh 1935; Ch. Moeller, 'Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 637–720; B. Altaner, 'Zum Schrifttum der "skythischen" (gotischen) Mönche', *HJ* 72 (1953), 568–81; A. Grillmeier, 'Der Neu-Chalkedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte', *HJ* 77 (1958), 151–66; S. Helmer, 'Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes', Diss. Bonn 1962; Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 104–72; *idem*, 'Neo-Chalcedonianism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine Theology', *BzF* 16 (1982), 61–70; Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 5–83. A short overview can be found in A. Grillmeier, *Mit ihm und in ihm. Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven*, Freiburg: Herder 1975, 371–85 and Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 329–59. For criticism of the general use of the term 'neo-Chalcedonianism' see K.-H. Uthemann, 'Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus. Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus', *StPatr* 29 (1997), 373–413.

[105] *Iohannes Caesariensis, Opera quae supersunt*, ed. M. Richard, CCG 1, Turnhout: Brepols 1977; Severus, *Contra impium Grammaticum*, ed. J. Lebon, CSCO 93/4, 101/2, 111/12, Leuven: Peeters 1952. See also K.-H. Uthemann, 'Antimonophysitische Aporien des Anastasios Sinaites', *BZ* 74 (1981), 11–26.

[106] It is unlikely that John the Chozibite can be identified with John the Grammarian; see S. Vailhé, 'Jean le Khozibite et Jean de Césarée', *EOr* 6 (1903), 107–13; Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 111. For the question whether John the Grammarian worked in Palestine or in Cappadocia: Ch. Moeller, 'Un représentant de la christologie néochalcédonienne au début du sixième siècle en orient: Nephalius d'Alexandrie', *RHE* 40 (1944/5), 103 (n. 1) and most recently Richard in the edition of John's works, *Opera quae supersunt*, vi; both believe Cappadocia is more plausible; Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus*, 160, plainly states that it was Caesarea in Palestine without commenting on it any further. Well-known neo-Chalcedonians in Palestine are especially Nephalius and Cyril of Scythopolis (for Nephalius see Moeller, 'Nephalius d'Alexandrie', 73–140).

crucifixus) or 'one of the Trinity suffered' (*unus ex Trinitate passus*).[107] As they saw in this soteriological formula a way to save Chalcedon from being slanderously accused of Nestorianism (that is, regarding Christ as mere man or speaking of two sons), scholars have assumed that the 'theopaschites proposed a reconciliation on the Christological basis of Chalcedon', which seems to be the way the theopaschite formula was used later by Justinian.[108] However, the original intention of theopaschites may not have been to reach out to the non-Chalcedonians, but only to defend 'their' Cyril against claims of the non-Chalcedonians to represent the Cyrillian legacy.

The first people who confronted Justin and Justinian to make a decision about this formula were Scythian monks who had a dispute with their bishop Paternus of Tomi.[109] They had come to Constantinople in early 519, but not gaining the approval they had hoped for, they left for Rome in the summer.[110] Their departure caused the papal legates and Justinian to warn the pope of their arrival and their theological request (29 June 519).[111] Justinian asked the pope not to receive them, but to send them back to Constantinople.[112] However, in July, Justinian sent another hastily written letter to the pope urging

[107] J. A. McGuckin, 'The "Theopaschite Confession" (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Re-interpretation of Chalcedon', *JEH* 35 (1984), 239–55; for the variations of the formula see Chapter 4.

[108] McGuckin, 'The "Theopaschite Confession"', 240 (there also (p. 239) about the name 'Theopaschites'). Also Grillmeier, *Mit ihm und in ihm*, 373, speaks of a 'Vermittlungstheologie'. Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*, 215–23, refutes this perception but without sufficient reason. A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol. iv, New York: Russell & Russell 1958, 230–2, calls the followers of Peter the Fuller 'Theopaschitians'. A short overview of the monks, the terminology, and bibliography is offered by D. Wyrwa, 'Drei Etappen der Rezeptionsgeschichte des Konzils von Chalkedon im Westen', in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, ed. J. van Oort and J. Roldanus, Leuven: Peeters 1997, 182–6. For the meaning of the term 'Nestorian'/'Nestorianism' see Introduction.

[109] Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 48–50; Grillmeier, *Mit ihm und in ihm*, 336–42. For a translation of the Theopaschite Confession see McGuckin, 'The "Theopaschite Confession"', 247–55. See also W. C. Bark, 'John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina', *HTR* 36 (1943), 93–107.

[110] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 190f.; Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 48: Scythian monks arrived already in 518 in Constantinople.

[111] *Coll. Avell.* 187, 216–18.

[112] *Coll. Avell.* 187. Haacke, *Glaubensformel*, 45f., believes that the messenger Eulogius forged this letter or parts of it, but Haacke's assumption is not persuasive.

him now to listen to the monks and grant their request.[113] As Justinian refers in his second letter to the peace of the churches, he must have had the reconciliation between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians in mind.[114] According to Justinian it was essential for the peace of the churches that the pope would approve the monks' request.

The Canadian scholar Patrick Gray rightly remarks that '[i]t is impossible to say exactly what happened in the few days between the writing of these letters'.[115] The theologian Uthemann states that the Goth Vitalian wrote a now lost letter to Justinian, which brought about Justinian's change of mind.[116] However, Vitalian had written earlier to the pope in favour of the monks, and it seems unlikely that he would have written to Justinian on this matter.[117] Considering the fact that Justinian and Vitalian, the two powerful men behind Justin, were certainly rivals, Vitalian's favour of the Scythian monks may have rather caused Justinian's original disfavour of them—until someone convinced him that the 'theopaschite formula' could work for the sake of the empire. That would also explain why Justinian continued to uphold the theopaschite formula also after Vitalian's assassination in July 520. The person who introduced Justinian to the 'theopaschite formula' might have been Soterichus.

There is much literature about Justinian as theologian and emperor and about his personal interest in theology.[118] Scholars have often postulated that he received a thorough theological education although the sources do not mention this.[119] He obviously did not advise his uncle about potential dangers of Hormisdas' *libellus*, and the way Justinian handled his first theological dispute with the

[113] *Coll. Avell.* 191.

[114] So also Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 49f. Justinian could hardly think of peace between different branches of Chalcedonians as the agreement with the pope was accomplished just three months before.

[115] Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 49.

[116] Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 17.

[117] Vitalian had written to Pope Hormisdas: *Coll. Avell.* 116 (11 August 515). Already Vasiliev believed that Vitalian made Justinian write the second letter.

[118] See literature in Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe'.

[119] Noethlich, 'Justinian', 674, emphasizes that nothing is known about Justinian's education; but cf. for example Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', 33, and Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 135.

Scythian monks demonstrates to say the least insecurity in theological issues.[120] It seems therefore not unlikely that he relied on outside advice.

At this time, John the Chozibite, the above mentioned bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, may have agitated in Constantinople for his case, and persuaded the emperor to let him stay in power and not to reinstate Elias. Thereby John might have introduced Justinian to the fact that neo-Chalcedonianism, including the theopaschite formula, was a well-known belief in eastern (neo-)Chalcedonian circles and not confined to the Scythian monks.[121] However, it may be worthwhile to look for a non-Chalcedonian who could have advised Justinian on this issue.

No evidence proves that Soterichus was behind Justinian's change of heart, but Soterichus—who may well have been in Constantinople at this time to lobby at the court against his possible condemnation as a heretic—is the first candidate that comes to mind. Severus, in a letter written probably in 519/20, pointed out that 'Soteric[hus] has fallen', and equated him to another bishop—Cyrus of Tyana—about whom he said:[122]

> How is it therefore that the excellent Cyrus asks for association only as he says to be permitted him like a man innocent on the other matters? And how is it that after confirming the impiety in writing he wishes to become an orthodox man not enrolled in writing and in a corner?[123]

[120] Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 332 with n. 6. Patrick Gray delivered a paper at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford entitled 'The "Emperor-Theologian" at Work: Justinian at the Conversations of 532', in which he demonstrates Justinian's lack of theological knowledge and interest in the debates of 532/3 (see Chapter 2). I am grateful to Patrick Gray for sending me a draft of his talk.

[121] See Philoxenus' letter to the monks of Senoun (Chapter 4).

[122] Severus, *Select Letters* V.13, Brooks 386f. (343f.). Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 110, dates this letter rightly to 519/20. Severus must have written the letter shortly after his banishment as Proclus—one of the addressees—was still at his see. Later we find Proclus among the expelled bishops. The patriarch in exile tried hard here to persuade Cappadocian bishops to remain on his side, even under the unpleasant circumstances. There might have been more bishops like Severus' addressees Eusebuna and Proclus who apparently hesitated long before they took a side. Maybe they had hoped that they would not be forced to take sides.

[123] The 'impiety in writing' perhaps refers to the decisions made by the council in Constantinople in 518. One of the bishops who subscribed is Kyriakos of Tyana, and Honigmann believes that this is possibly Cyrus; see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 113f.

Although abominable for Severus, it was possible for other bishops like Cyrus and Soterichus to mediate between the two parties and to find a position that accepted Chalcedon without betraying their Cyrillian faith.[124] The neo-Chalcedonian persuasion most likely formed the basis for this Cyrillian faith, perhaps including the theopaschite formula for the liturgy.

While in Constantinople in 511 and not yet patriarch, Severus observed the attempt of non-Chalcedonians to add the 'who was crucified for us' to the Trisagion (which formed part of the liturgy), and informed Soterichus about the subsequent riots organized by the Chalcedonian patriarch Macedonius.[125] Furthermore, as noted above, John the Grammarian may have been active in Caesarea in Cappadocia, and might have influenced his bishop Soterichus during the years 512–18. John the Grammarian was not a theopaschite, but his neo-Chalcedonian understanding and terminology of the different natures might have won over Soterichus for Chalcedon. That would explain Soterichus' opposition to Severus,[126] and would render his switches from accepting Chalcedon to denouncing it and back as representing a development towards a theopaschite and neo-Chalcedonian position. Afraid of being accused of his non-Chalcedonian deeds in the past, he might have tried in the summer of 519—when Justinian wrote to the pope about the Scythian monks—to present himself as a mediator and propose the liturgical-soteriological formula of the theopaschites and John the Grammarian's Christology to Justinian as a solution which might also reconcile non-Chalcedonians to Chalcedon.[127] Justinian pressed Pope Hormisdas on the theopaschite

[124] Already Helmer, 'Der Neuchalkedonismus', 116 with n. 136, saw neo-Chalcedonian influence on Soterichus, but did not support his statement further.

[125] As recorded by Evagrius, *HE* III.4, Bidez and Parmentier, 146 (Whitby, 195). The letter survived in Coptic and is edited by G. Garitte, 'Fragments Coptes d'une lettre de Sévère d'Antioche à Sotérichos de Césarée', *Muséon* 65 (1952), 185–98. For the Trisagion see Chapter 4.

[126] Soterichus and Severus had no longer been in communion after 516/17; see Severus, *Collected Letters* 46, Brooks, 319. It is not clear if a controversy over diptychs was preceded by this, and if Soterichus might have been even stricter than Severus concerning suspicious names; see Severus, *Collection of Letters* 45, Brooks, 313–15.

[127] This can only be a suggestion: it is impossible to understand Soterichus' moves completely with the sources that have survived. Honigmann makes the observation that the name of the bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Socrates, mentioned in Michael the Syrian to have been forced to accept Chalcedon in 527, may have been a

issue without success,[128] but once introduced, the formula stayed on Justinian's agenda, and through two imperial decrees in 533 it became part of the official Chalcedonian doctrine.

A NEW PATRIARCH FOR ANTIOCH: PAUL 'THE JEW'

Meanwhile the East waited for Justin to make a far-reaching decision: the appointment of a new patriarch of Antioch.[129] After the Council of Constantinople had been held in July 518, the fruits of the new policy could be harvested in Jerusalem, Tyre, and Syria II, where—not surprisingly—councils were held by Chalcedonian clergy who responded favourably to the new policy.[130] These councils anathematized Severus, and in addition, the Council of Syria II also condemned and deposed their metropolitan, Peter of Apamea, who had been Severus' candidate and was the only non-Chalcedonian bishop in the province.[131] Nevertheless, it is not the case that cities or whole provinces were now 'freed' from non-Chalcedonian bishops. Vasiliev, who believed that '[t]here is no doubt that about the same time in many other cities of the Byzantine Empire similar synods took place for the rejection of the monophysite heresy and its adherents', is most likely wrong.[132] The councils were held in provinces which were

misspelling of Soterichus, Honigmann, 'Heraclianus of Chalcedon (537 A.D.?), Soterichus of Caesarea in Cappadocia and Achillius', in *idem*, *Patristic Studies*, 211; and Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 112. If this is the case and considering the conjecture made above, Soterichus might have still been a persuaded Cyrillian all his life, but accepted or refuted the Council of Chalcedon as it was opportune to him.

[128] *Coll. Avell.* 188.

[129] Flavian II had died in exile; see *The Chronicle of Marcellinus* 512, Croke, 37.

[130] *ACO* III, 77–106; Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 148–60.

[131] The bishops of Syria II proved already their Chalcedonian stand and non-cooperation with non-Chalcedonians before 518 when Severus had summoned them to Antioch; see Severus, *Select Letters* I.20, Brooks, 78–80 (70–3). It seems that all the lower clergy in Apamea were Chalcedonians while only Peter was non-Chalcedonian: *ACO* III, 103–6.

[132] Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 160, who literally paraphrases C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii, Freiburg: Herder, 2nd edn. 1875, 692. J. Speigl, 'Synoden im Gefolge der Wende der Religionspolitik unter Kaiser Justinos (518)', *OstKSt* 45 (1996), 20, rejects Hefele's hypothesis.

primarily Chalcedonian or at least ruled by Chalcedonian bishops already under Anastasius and Severus.

Although Evagrius points out that the *comes Orientis* Irenaeus was supposed to arrest Severus, the patriarch did not leave Antioch within the first two months of Justin's accession.[133] Possibly in an effort to threaten him and force him to leave his see, a rumour was spread that Vitalian wanted to have Severus' tongue cut out, and in September 518 Severus left for Egypt.[134] Although opposed and anathematized by all bishops in his province, Peter of Apamea only left his city more than half a year after Justin had become emperor.[135] But with the exception of these two sees, it seems that the religious landscape in the East did not change significantly before the new patriarch of Antioch was appointed.

The *Henoticon* was still in force until Rome and Constantinople came to an agreement in March 519. Afterwards the emperor informed the pope that those who were hesitant in accepting the union needed to be corrected, and were to be admonished to follow the example of the capital.[136] De Halleux interpreted this as Justin's attempt to break any resistance, but that can hardly be the case.[137] The pope felt compelled to admonish the emperor to take care of the correction of the Alexandrian, Antiochene, and other churches.[138] However, this was only wishful thinking on the side of the pope, who would have liked his negotiator and confidant Dioscorus, an Egyptian, to become the new patriarch of Alexandria.[139] Constantinople apparently did not respond to this proposition at all—Justin did not plan to introduce either the pope's favourite or any other Chalcedonian candidate to the traditionally non-Chalcedonian see of Saint Mark. The disaster of

[133] Evagrius, *HE* IV.4, Bidez and Parmentier, 154f. (Whitby, 202).

[134] Evagrius, *HE* IV.4, Bidez and Parmentier, 155 (Whitby, 203) and also John of Nikiu, *Chronicle*, 90.8 (*The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.) Coptic Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. R. H. Charles, Text and Translation Society 3, London 1916, 133) report that Vitalian wanted to cut out Severus' tongue because Severus had insulted him in his writings (Severus mocked Vitalian after his defeat in 513; see Severus, *Les Homiliae Cathedrales* 34, ed. F. Graffin, in *PO* 36, Turnhout: Brepols 1972, 430–7); Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.2, Brooks, 63 (Brooks, 43; Hamilton and Brooks, 191) suggests that Vitalian hated Severus because Flavian II was Vitalian's godson.

[135] Some time after 6 January 519; see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 62.

[136] *Coll. Avell.* 160; see Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 179.

[137] A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1963, 93.

[138] *Coll. Avell.* 168. [139] *Coll. Avell.* 175.

installing the Chalcedonian Proterius in Alexandria after 451 was presumably still remembered in Constantinople.[140] Justin saw no need—and probably did not feel secure enough on the throne—to stir up non-Chalcedonians in Egypt at this point.[141] Whereas the pope already envisaged a Chalcedonian *oecumene*, Constantinople thought in rather practical steps of how to enforce Chalcedon.

To find a qualified man for the office of the patriarch in Antioch was of 'utmost importance' in order to fill the vacuum of religious guidance and power which had existed since Severus was condemned and had left.[142] The situation in the patriarchate of Antioch was complicated. According to the lists of bishops, the province of Syria II was completely Chalcedonian (with the exception of Peter of Apamea); Syria I, Osrhoene, Mesopotamia I and II, and Phoenicia Libanesia seem to have been dominated by a non-Chalcedonian majority, while other provinces were rather divided.[143] In Antioch

[140] Proterius could only be installed with the help of soldiers and was killed a few years later by the mob; see J. Meyendorff, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450–680 A.D.*, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1989, 188f. Emperors often tended to be rather pragmatic in religious issues: see Sozomenus, *HE* II.32 (trans. in Socrates and Sozomenus, *Church Histories*, trans. A. C. Zenos and C. D. Hartranft, NPNF 2, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1952, 281) for the case of the Montanists: they were suppressed in the whole empire except in Phrygia because there they were too numerous.

[141] As already noted by Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 247, and Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon*, 48.

[142] G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1961, 516.

[143] See the list of bishops in A. van Roey, 'Les débuts de l'Eglise jacobite', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 347f. The list might reflect a somewhat distorted perception because the non-Chalcedonian sources mention only non-Chalcedonian bishops who left their sees, not bishops who stayed in office. Therefore in some provinces there might have been bishoprics in 518/22 of which we do not know. It is very possible that all bishoprics mentioned in 536 at the Council of Constantinople had already existed in 518/22 (for example Sophanene). However, it might also be the case that the Chalcedonians increased the numbers of bishoprics in order to have more control. In 570, when the Notitia Antiochena was written, most probably more bishoprics existed than in 518/22 although this did not necessarily have anything to do with the Chalcedonian–non-Chalcedonian controversy. See E. Honigmann, 'Studien zur Notitia Antiochena', *BZ* 25 (1925), 60–88; Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche* with E. Honigmann, 'The Patriarchate of Antioch: A Revision of Le Quien and the *Notitia Antiochena*', *Traditio* 5 (1947), 135–61; see also *idem*, 'The Original Lists of the Members of the Council of Nicaea, the Robber-Synod and the Council of Chalcedon', *Byz.* 16 (1942/3), 20–80.

itself clergy and followers loyal to Severus had remained even after the patriarch's flight,[144] and since Severus was a charismatic leader, it is plausible that he had left behind dedicated clergy and followers also in Syria I and beyond. On the other hand, his incorruptibility, integrity, and staunch non-Chalcedonianism had stirred up many people against him.[145]

If the accusations brought up by Syrian monks at the Council of Constantinople in 518 were true, Severus, however, might have been responsible for slaughtering 350 Chalcedonian monks (and appropriating church vessels). But these monks were supposedly killed by Jews, (non-Chalcedonian) monks, and seculars, a scenario which speaks against an immediate involvement of Severus.[146] It could of course be that Severus silently tolerated this violence against his opponents, a silence which also encouraged peasants to attack Chalcedonian monasteries in order to appropriate their valuables.[147] Severus' metropolitan Peter of Apamea in Syria II did not help to de-escalate the situation: he sent Isaurians (a term which can hardly mean anything else than mercenaries) againt the Chalcedonian monastery of Maron—apparently in order to arrest unruly monks. He might have been faced with rebellious monks who not only questioned his authority but also threatened civil order. In that case the deployment of military forces was legitimate and could explain casualties among the monks.[148] Be this as it may, Severus' (and Peter's) opponents interpreted their behaviour as religious violence,

[144] Severus, *Select Letters* IV.8, Brooks, 302–4 (268–70).

[145] Especially the collection of *Select Letters* demonstrates that Severus fought against greedy and corruptible clergy; see for example Severus, *Select Letters*, I.4 and I.17, Brooks, 25–37 and 70–3 (23–34 and 63–6).

[146] *ACO* III, 106.

[147] *ACO* III, 107. Theophanes mentions violence of peasants against Chalcedonians as well; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6005, de Boor, 157 (Mango and Scott, 239).

[148] *ACO* III, 107. Some of the accusations against Severus and Peter—their involvement with Jews, prostitutes, etc.—are too bizarre to be taken seriously. In general, the evidence on what happened in Syria under Severus is too thin to draw a definite conclusion but one is reminded of a situation in 521: here the Chalcedonians deployed soldiers to crush the insurrection of rebellious non-Chalcedonian monks of Amida. Although the casualties had been much less (50 persons were beaten to death), their deaths are better documented because the monks of Amida found in John of Ephesus a historian who preserved their fate; see Chapter 3. For the monastery of Maron see Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche, passim.*

and one must imagine a religious landscape in Syria of two polarizing parties that held deep resentments against each other.

Another issue had troubled the patriarchate of Antioch deeply during Severus' tenure. The non-Chalcedonian patriarch complained about the poverty of the patriarchate which had also caused severe disputes with his bishops:

> But, when I had had experience of the distressful state of affairs, and had seen in what a pitiable and wretched condition the fortunes of our holy church were, and that a great load of debts and of interest was hanging over it and threatening to overwhelm it, I forgot the spiritual laws: and it now seems to me a great thing to find men to lend; and meanwhile I make use of the term 'interest' as if it were some lawful name.[149]

Therefore the election of a new patriarch in this situation was indeed a sensitive issue requiring a man with many skills. On the one hand the new patriarch should have been able to handle financial issues well, but on the other hand he also needed to be trusted that he could persuasively represent the new religious policy. He would be responsible for the enforcement of the *libellus*, and how it was enforced. If necessary, he could expel and appoint new bishops, but as the controversy over Nicaea in the fourth century had demonstrated, force was a double-edged sword. Even more on the mind of the Chalcedonians was the case of John Chrysostom, the former bishop of Constantinople (398–404): he had been expelled, but still enjoyed loyal followers in the capital and beyond, and had been brought back into the diptychs by popular demand.[150]

One would expect that the Chalcedonians painstakingly tried to avoid the mistakes of their predecessors in power. Expulsions demonstrated the unpopularity of a governmental policy, and the executive in charge could easily be labelled 'persecutor'. The Chalcedonians must have sought—to use Athanasius' phrase—'not to compel, but to persuade'.[151] But in order to persuade bishops in the East, a patriarch with good administrative skills was needed.

[149] Severus, *Select Letters* I.17, Brooks, 71 (64).

[150] C. Thiersch, *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinople (398–404)*, STAC 6, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000, 379–414, calls this 'Der Umgang mit einem lebenden Mythos'. See also her chapter 'Triumphale Rückkehr?' (415–23).

[151] See above. There is no instance in non-Chalcedonian texts of a random slaughter as the *History of the Arians* for example reports concerning the attack on the church of Quirinus in Alexandria (*History of the Arians* 10).

Thus it took the court a long time before a new patriarch of Antioch was ordained, probably in June 519.[152] However, it seems not so much that the search for a suitable candidate itself had taken so long, but rather the problem of satisfying the interests of different groups. In the end, not the Scythian monks, but the papal legates found an open ear at court.[153] It might have been a concession of the emperor to involve them in the search, and accept a candidate of whom they approved in order to secure a good relationship with the papacy.[154]

The choice fell on the administrator of the hospice of Eubulus in Constantinople, the priest Paul.[155] Justin probably considered him to be a good candidate because Paul had papal approval and, as administrator, he brought in financial skills which were needed in order to master Antioch's financial problems. However, Paul had also been in Antioch for two years and resisted Severus' non-Chalcedonian rule. It was therefore an unfortunate choice as Paul was hardly a person who was willing to reconcile with or win over non-Chalcedonians for Chalcedon. Furthermore, empowered with his new position, he could take revenge against former opponents. Soon he earned for himself the unflattering cognomen 'the Jew'.[156]

For a smooth transition and as an aid so that the poverty of the patriarchate of Antioch would not be a cause for immediate strife, Justin endowed Paul with 1,000 pounds of gold.[157] As not all bishops were immune to corruptibility, and as at least two bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch had left their sees during Severus' tenure because of the low payment, part of the money might have been intended to win over those clergy with rather secular interests. It is

[152] Letters to the pope (*Coll. Avell.* 216 and 217) from this time mention that finally a candidate was chosen. The legates certainly wrote these letters shortly after the decision was made in order to inform the pope about this important issue as soon as possible. As late as April the papal legates had written to Rome that a suitable candidate had not yet been found (*Coll. Avell.* 167 and 223).

[153] *Coll. Avell.* 216.

[154] Maybe Justin also wished to compensate the pope for not replacing the non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria with the papal legate Dioscorus.

[155] Priest: *Coll. Avell.* 216 and 217; administrator: John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.6, Thurn, 338 (E. and M. Jeffreys and Scott, 231f.) and *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 19 (Harrak, 51f.).

[156] See below.

[157] Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6011, de Boor, 165 (Mango and Scott, 250).

not possible to say exactly how the money was used, but it seems obvious that it was given to Paul to facilitate his task.[158]

Paul had to proclaim the Council of Chalcedon in public, and put the 630 bishops who had allegedly been present at Chalcedon into the diptychs.[159] The chronicler Malalas pointed out that Paul 'changed the diptychs of the churches of every city'. However, this can only refer to every city where Paul was able to enforce Chalcedon and the *libellus*. This seems to have only been the case in cities in the western part of his patriarchate, and the evidence as analysed below suggests that the enforcement of Chalcedon in general was a slow process that took several years before new Chalcedonian bishops were installed everywhere (522).

Paul the Jew probably enforced Chalcedon in all cities in Syria I—although the sources only give explicit proof for Qenneshre/Chalcis and Seleucia from which Paul expelled the non-Chalcedonian bishops Isidore and Nonnus.[160] Nonnus, a wealthy ex-governor of Mesopotamia I, left for his home town Amida, the metropolitan city of Mesopotamia I. Here he was ordained metropolitan, succeeding Thomas, who—unwilling to sign the *libellus*—died at the very moment the couriers of Paul arrived in the city. However, having been in office for only three months, Nonnus died. Subsequently, three bishops of Mesopotamia I ordained the non-Chalcedonian governor Mara bar Kustant as Nonnus' successor.[161] Mara probably stayed in office until the second half of 521 when the Chalcedonian Abraham

[158] Since John Malalas states that hippodromes were built for the Seleucians and the Isaurians under Paul's tenure, part of the money might have been spent for very secular purposes as well; John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.7, Thurn, 338 (E. and M. Jeffreys and Scott, 232).

[159] Evagrius, *HE* IV.4, Bidez and Parmentier, 155 (Whitby, 203). John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.6, Thurn, 338 (E. and M. Jeffreys and Scott, 232).

[160] Nonnus was expelled by Paul; Isidore was sent into exile together with Mara, whom Paul expelled from Amida; it seems therefore very likely that it was Paul as well who expelled Isidore—probably around the same time as Nonnus; *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 30–2 (Harrak, 59f.).

[161] Two of them appear in the list of exiled non-Chalcedonian bishops, Nonnus of Martyropolis and Aaron of Arsamosata, but the third, Arathu of Ingilene, must have died or signed the *libellus*; see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79 (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 208). John of Ephesus states that there was a quick succession of bishops in Ingilene; see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints 5*, in *PO* 17, 98.

bar Kayli succeeded him. As Paul the Jew already resigned before May 521, Mesopotamia I was not a province where Paul had been able to enforce the *libellus*.

Similar was the situation in the province of Osrhoene. As in the case of Nonnus, Paul's strategy was to target the highest cleric of the province and force him to sign the *libellus*. Paul sent the *magister utriusque militiae praesentalis* Patricius, but his expedition to Edessa caused great disturbances and ended in a disaster. The metropolitan Paul of Edessa neither signed the *libellus* nor resigned from his office, but fled to a baptistery. As Patricius led Paul away by force, the citizens and monks from surrounding monasteries started a riot and in the following street fights people were killed.[162] It is not entirely clear where Paul was brought, but Justin intervened and allowed Paul to return to Edessa. He remained in office until Euphrasius, the successor of Paul the Jew in Antioch, removed him in July 522 because he still had not signed the *libellus*.[163] Euphrasius also forced the other non-Chalcedonian bishops of Osrhoene—like John of Tella—to leave their sees. In 519 'the persecution of the churches had not yet spread to the East of the Euphrates' as Elias wrote in his

[162] *Chronicle of Edessa* 831 in *Chronica Minora*, vol. i, ed. and trans. I. Guidi, CSCO 1, 2, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955, 10 (9); see also the edition by Hallier with useful commentary: L. Hallier, *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik*, TU 9, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich 1892, 154 (126f.); *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 24f. (Harrak, 55f.). Mentioning a bloody incident in Edessa, Philoxenus in his letter to the monks of Senoun most likely refers to Patricius' attempt to force Paul of Edessa to accept Chalcedon; see Halleux in his translation of the letter: *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, ed. and trans. A. de Halleux, 2 vols., CSCO 231, 232, Leuven: Peeters 1963, 81 (67 with n. 9 and introduction, p. iii). If the Chronicle of Edessa is correct about the date of Philoxenus' banishment—which the chronicle is not for Severus' flight—the metropolitan of Mabbug was banished between 10 July and 30 September 519 (see also Hallier, *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik*, 124–6).

[163] *Chronicle of Zuqnin*: Paul of Edessa was brought to Paul the Jew and defected his faith; *Chronicle of Edessa*: Paul of Edessa was brought to Seleucia and the emperor let him return; Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.4, Brooks, 75 (Brooks, 51; Hamilton and Brooks, 203) mentioned that Paul was exiled to Euchaita. Jacob of Sarug's letter to Paul of Edessa after his return confirms that the emperor intervened; see letter 32, in *Iacobi Sarugensis Epistulae Quotquot Supersunt*, ed. G. Olinder, CSCO 110, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1965, 241–6 (French translation: *Les lettres de Jacques de Saroug*, trans. M. Albert, Patrimoine Syriaque 3, Kaslik 2004, 316–22).

Life of John of Tella,[164] but two years later John was requested to sign the *libellus*.[165]

Paul had more success in the province of Euphratesia, a province on the western side of the Euphrates neighbouring Syria I. He must have removed and banished Philoxenus of Mabbug, the metropolitan of the province, to first Gangra and then Philippopolis in Thrace before November 519.[166] Apparently Philoxenus was not very popular in his own city, and many of his fellow citizens in Mabbug joined the Chalcedonians.[167]

An episode from Cyrrhus, a city in the western part of Euphratesia,[168] shows that Paul succeeded in expelling other non-Chalcedonian bishops in Euphratesia in 519/20 as well. He or perhaps the new metropolitan of Mabbug replaced Sergius, the non-Chalcedonian bishop of Cyrrhus, with a bishop of the same name. However, Paul's success here was short-lived. Soldiers accused this second Sergius of having celebrated an assembly for Theodoret (of Cyrrhus), Diodore (of Tarsus), Theodore (of Mopsuestia), and Nestorius (whom the celebrators claimed to have been a martyr of the province). In this context the name Nestorius can only refer to the former patriarch of Constantinople (428–31) who was born in Germanicia (in the province Euphratesia). The others were closely linked with Nestorius' extreme dyophysitism: Diodore of Tarsus (fourth century) had been the founder of the Antiochene dyophysite school and was condemned

[164] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, in *Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum*, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 7–8, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1907, 56; English translation: 'The Biography of John of Tella (d. A.D. 537) by Elias', trans. J. R. Ghanem, Ph.D. Thesis, Madison, Wisc. 1970, 67; see also the older edition with Dutch translation: *Het Leven van Johannes van Tella door Elias*, ed. and trans. H. G. Kleyn, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882, 35f.

[165] Not in 519 as often believed; see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 48–54. For a possible chronology of Osrhoene in the years after Justin's ascension to the throne, see V. Menze: 'Jacob of Sarug, John of Tella, and Paul of Edessa: Ecclesiastical Politics in Osrhoene 519–522' (forthcoming 2008).

[166] Philoxenus mentioned in his letter to the monks of Senoun that he left Mabbug just before a bloody incident in Edessa took place—which very likely (as stated in n. 162) refers to the incident described above; *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, de Halleux, 81 (67).

[167] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, de Halleux, 81f. (67f).

[168] Probably not autocephalous as P. Hindo, *Disciplina Antiochena Antica Siri*, vol. ii, Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana 1951, 439f., believed; see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 68.

in the East at least since 507.[169] Theodore of Mopsuestia (350–428) was held in high esteem by the Church of the East in Persia, but as he had been Nestorius' teacher, he was suspected of being a heretic in the Roman empire.[170] Theodore later became part of the Three Chapters controversy, like the dogmatic writings of Theodoret (393–466), who was considered a heretic even in some Chalcedonian circles.[171] Therefore, in August 520 the emperor ordered the *magister utriusque militiae per Orientem* Hypatius to investigate Sergius' deeds.[172] Hypatius should also investigate whether Sergius had known that before his arrival in Cyrrhus two of his clergy had placed an image of Theodoret in a chariot and made a procession, 'singing a psalm [...] in honour of the image'.[173] Paul must have known about the celebration in Cyrrhus as Sergius stayed with him in Antioch at this time.[174] As a result of this incident in Cyrrhus, Paul must have stirred up opposition among both groups, non-Chalcedonians as well as Chalcedonians, causing a serious blow for Justin's religious policy in general.

[169] L. Abramowski, 'La prétendue condamnation de Diodore de Tarse en 499', *RHE* 40 (1965), 64f.; see also Haarer, *Anastasius I*, 140f.

[170] The (Assyrian) Church of the East is still often called 'Nestorian Church' by western scholars; see S. Brock, 'The "Nestorian" Church: A Lamentable Misnomer', in *The Church of the East: Life and Thought*, ed. J. F. Coakley and K. Parry, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78.3 (1996), 23–35 [reprinted in S. Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2006].

[171] Justin wrote that Theodoret 'everywhere is accused because of error of faith' which certainly did not refer to the non-Chalcedonians who had condemned Theodoret as a heretic. For the Three Chapters controversy see general Conclusion.

[172] *ACO* IV.1, 199f.; see also Severus, *Select Letters* V.12, Brooks, 380–5 (337–42).

[173] *ACO* IV.1, 199f.; translation in *Roman State and Christian Church: A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*, vol. iii, trans. P. R. Coleman-Norton, London: SPCK 1966, 981f., based on the text in *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. ix, ed. J. D. Mansi, Florence: Expenses Antonii Zatta 1763 [reprint Berlin and Paris 1902], 364f. See also Chapter 2.

As for icons: the non-Chalcedonians were not strictly opposed to the veneration of icons as once the German Byzantinist Ostrogorsky had believed; for non-Chalcedonians and icons see: S. Brock, 'Iconoclasm and the Monophysites', in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin, Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies 1977, 53–7. For veneration of images in the sixth century see now: Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*, 528ff.

[174] Even if Sergius did not initiate the processions, he would have been responsible for preventing them—and with him Paul, Sergius' superior.

For all other provinces no evidence has survived. Syria II was already Chalcedonian and Paul probably only installed a new Chalcedonian metropolitan. Mesopotamia II on the other hand was far away from Antioch at the Roman–Persian border, and, since Paul had already proved unable to enforce Chalcedon in Mesopotamia I and Osrhoene, most likely he was also unsuccessful here. Although it is unclear when the non-Chalcedonian bishops of Cilicia, Isauria, Phoenicia, etc. left their sees, Severus' letters demonstrate that some non-Chalcedonian bishops held still on to their sees while their patriarch had already fled to Egypt.[175] The enforcement of the papal *libellus* therefore certainly took several years before it was implemented everywhere. Paul's successor as patriarch of Antioch did not enforce it in Osrhoene before 522 and maybe even later in the eastern parts of Mesopotamia as Marde, close to the Persian border, functioned as an area of retreat for expelled non-Chalcedonian bishops and monks.[176]

Paul resigned after less than two years in office, before May 521.[177] By at least silently allowing the processions in Cyrrhus, Paul must have offended any moderate Chalcedonian in the East. He transgressed the *communis opinio* among Chalcedonians who wanted to defend Chalcedon against the accusations that the council of 451 was Nestorian. The Palestinian theopaschite theology seems to have been successful in attracting people who may have been worried that the acceptance of Chalcedon would not disassociate them from being regarded as Nestorians.[178] With the agreement of the Palestinian bishops to the changes made in Constantinople in 518 and the imperial favour for Chalcedon this tendency may have been increased. However, since Paul probably even supported heretical dyophysite outbursts, the patriarch of Jerusalem and other Chalcedonian

[175] See above the case of Eusebuna in Cappadocia; Severus, *Select Letters* V.13, Brooks, 385–9 (342–5).

[176] See Chapter 4.

[177] In September 520 Paul was still in office, in May 521 the pope was informed that Paul resigned because of his misdeeds (*Coll. Avell.* 241 and 242). Also *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 24 (Harrak, 54f.) states that Paul was recalled because of his misdeeds and died soon afterwards.

[178] See Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, de Halleux, 75 (62).

bishops probably struggled again to defend their theology against accusations of Nestorianism.

Philoxenus wrote in 521 that it was the people of Antioch—apparently regardless of their religious preferences for or against Chalcedon—who gave Paul the cognomen 'Jew'.[179] Without the support of his own citizens and the important Chalcedonian bishoprics in the East it is obvious that Paul had insurmountable difficulties in enforcing Chalcedon everywhere—even if he might have had some support among radical monks in Syria II and among people who favoured Theodore or even Nestorius.[180] Paul's couriers were helpless witnesses when the non-Chalcedonian governor of Mesopotamia I was ordained metropolitan of Amida. In a province like Mesopotamia I in which the local elite was probably non-Chalcedonian—and, as the example of Mara, the governor and later bishop proves, clerical and worldly power intertwined—Paul would have needed the full support from the Chalcedonians in the East and the emperor. In other provinces like Mesopotamia II the situation was probably similar to Mesopotamia I.

However, Paul 'the Jew' had seriously damaged his position in the capital by causing major disturbances in two provinces. The forceful removal of the metropolitan Paul of Edessa from a baptistery causing an uproar that could only be crushed by troops was not how Justin imagined his policy being enforced. Justin intervened in order to correct the patriarch's misdeed, and Jacob of Sarug praised the emperor in a letter to Paul of Edessa as the 'faithful emperor [...] [who] was moved and hastened to return you to your see'.[181] However, Justin's intervention had hardly anything to do with faith; Justin rather tried to undo the unjustifiable violence used against a member of the ruling class and bishop, regardless of the fact that Paul of Edessa had not signed the *libellus*. But as Michael Gaddis points out, it was 'easier to let the law be violated than to punish the wrongdoers

[179] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, de Halleux, 75 (61).

[180] Nestorius had even been in the diptychs in Tarsus in the time of Severus; Severus, *Select Letters* I.24, Brooks, 92–4 (83–5). See Chapter 2.

[181] *Iacobi Sarugensis Epistulae*, Olinder, 241–6 (Albert, 316–22), quoted from Vasiliev, 234, who translated from the earlier edition of P. Martin, 'Lettres de Jacques de Saroug aux moines du couvent de Mar Bassus, et à Paul d'Edesse', *ZDMG* 30 (1876), 274.

and thus risk earning those Christians the title of martyrs—and themselves that of persecutors'.[182]

If a bishop could not be persuaded to sign the *libellus*, it was probably best for both sides if the bishop quietly left the city. A bishop could only stay if he was sure that he had extraordinary support in his city. Paul of Edessa had acted cleverly and the blame was on the imperial side. However, he was an exception, and especially bishops with a distinct theological persuasion certainly had opponents among their flock. John of Tella, whose non-Chalcedonian faith was challenged on his arrival in Tella, left his city immediately when he was required to sign the *libellus*.[183] Philoxenus on the other hand, who had refused to leave, faced the unhappy experience of being turned on by his citizens who acquiesced to the imperial will. By contrast Mara, the non-Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida, could rely not only on the general support of non-Chalcedonians in his province, but also on his secular power as governor which facilitated his resistance against an unpopular man like Paul.

The patriarch of Antioch gave Justin reason to intervene a second time concerning the celebrations in Cyrrhus. The letter required Flavius Hypatius to find out the truth or to 'fear not only our indignation, but also God's wrath'. The harsh language conveys the urgency of the matter and the emperor's impatience about this highly improper outburst.[184] The emperor disassociated himself from this—certainly extreme—result of enforcing Chalcedon in the East, and thereby from Paul. Paul's resignation, therefore, must be regarded as the consequential result of losing local and imperial support. Justin had carefully chosen a patriarch with whom Rome could not find fault in matters of faith and who probably brought in qualities important for financial problems which troubled the church of Antioch. However, he lacked any ability to find a *modus vivendi* for the divergent Christian groups in the patriarchate of Antioch.

[182] Gaddis, *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 191, referring to an incident in Callinicum: see also Ambrose's letters 40 and 41 and N. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1994, 298–309.

[183] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 56f. (Ghanem, 67).

[184] *ACO* IV.1, 200; translation in *Roman State and Christian Church*, vol. iii, Coleman-Norton, 982.

CONCLUSION: THE SPLIT BETWEEN CHALCEDONIANS AND NON-CHALCEDONIANS

Through the enforcement of the papal *libellus* different understandings of what was to be regarded as 'Chalcedonian' came to the forefront. Because the Chalcedonians in the East and in Rome had not been in communion since 482, the somewhat forced communion of March 519 in Constantinople uncovered tensions between Rome and the Chalcedonian East. Macedonius of Constantinople and also Flavian II of Antioch were held in honour by eastern Chalcedonians because they had opposed Severus and suffered for their faith with the loss of their sees. Eastern Chalcedonian bishops who had welcomed Justin and the Council of Constantinople in July 518 were therefore antagonized that their martyrs for the Chalcedonian cause were not rewarded. Epiphanius, the Chalcedonian bishop of Tyre, an old enemy of Severus and brother of the former patriarch Flavian II, could not have been pleased with Paul the Jew's policy. Although Flavian II is not explicitly mentioned by the *libellus*, the former patriarch as follower of the *Henoticon* was condemned by definition.

In theological terms the pre-Severian Antioch could hardly have been regarded as Chalcedonian in the eyes of the pope.[185] Also the stronghold of Chalcedonianism in the East, Palestine, was neo-Chalcedonian and unlikely to support enthusiastically the extreme Chalcedonian policy of the new patriarch in Antioch.

However, the pope pushed through his *libellus*, and it became the cornerstone of orthodoxy that any bishop in the East had to sign. But the enforcement of this *libellus* in connection with Paul the Jew's provocative policy strengthened the resistance of the non-Chalcedonians. Probably because of Paul the Jew's violent action against Paul of Edessa, the enforcement of the *libellus* east of the Euphrates was delayed by roughly two years.[186] Philoxenus could write that after he had been arrested 'the Lord awoke the spirit of the

[185] See for the disputed addition to the Trisagion that had been proclaimed in Antioch (as mentioned in Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VII.7, Brooks, 40 (Brooks, 27f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 169)) Chapter 4.

[186] See above and John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 35, in *PO* 18, 607, who remarks that the monasteries in Amida were expelled in the year 832 (=521).

faithful everywhere and [the spirit] of the God-loving monks from Antioch up to the Persian border', probably in the second half of 519.[187]

Abandoning the *Henoticon* and enforcing the *libellus* changed the episcopal landscape of the East completely, and a chance to work on a reconciliation between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonins on the basis of the theopaschite formula had been missed in 519. Even before the final enforcement of the *libellus* under Paul's successor Euphrasius—who was from Jerusalem and was certainly chosen in order to ensure that no rift arose between the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem—it established a visible boundary between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. Before the enforcement of the *libellus* it remained difficult to define the patriarch Dioscorus II of Alexandria (516/17) clearly as non-Chalcedonian and Flavian II clearly as Chalcedonian. Now the *libellus* established a clear division between the two groups. Bishops, and probably to a lesser degree the lower clergy and monks, had to decide if they would accept the *libellus* or go into exile. Although internally not at all a homogeneous group, after Paul the Jew's tenure, the non-Chalcedonians in the East arose, in opposition to those who accepted the *libellus*, as a well-defined group.[188]

[187] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, de Halleux, 80 (66). As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the non-Chalcedonian monks used the delay to prepare their resistance.

[188] That the non-Chalcedonians were not a homogeneous group demonstrates the quarrels between Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus that burst out very soon after both had fled to Egypt; see Chapter 4.

2

The *Libellus* of Hormisdas: A Remodelling of the Past

THE DEBATE IN CONSTANTINOPLE IN 532/3: PART I

Ten years after John of Tella had refused to sign the papal *libellus* in 521 and had been in hiding in the mountains around Marde and in Persia, the emperor summoned him to the capital.[1] Reviewing the harsh policy against non-Chalcedonians implemented during the reign of his uncle Justin I, the emperor Justinian (527–65) decided to convene a debate between Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian bishops in Constantinople. John, accompanied by some fellow bishops from the East,[2] journeyed westwards and met with five Chalcedonian bishops in the palace of Hormisdas, close to Justinian's palace, in 532/3.[3]

[1] For John hiding in the mountains around Marde see: Severus, *Select Letters* V.14, Brooks, 389 (345); for Persia see Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, ed. E. W. Brooks in *Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum*, CSCO 7–8, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1907, 72 (trans. 'The Biography of John of Tella (d. A.D. 537) by Elias', trans. J. R. Ghanem, Ph.D. Thesis, Madison, Wisc. 1970, 83). For Justinian having him summoned to the capital in 531 see: Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 84, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1921, 82 (trans. *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, vol. iv, trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 88, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1924, 56; *The Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, London: Methuen & Co. 1899, 212).

[2] For the various numbers of non-Chalcedonian bishops given in the accounts see S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 117f. and J. Speigl, 'Das Religionsgespräch mit den severianischen Bischöfen in Konstantinopel im Jahre 532', *AHC* 16 (1984), 271f.

[3] Brock, 'The Conversations', 92f.; for the palace of Hormisdas in Constantinople see: Procopius, *Buildings* I.x.4, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 343, Cambridge,

This debate attempted to find 'some means for the peace of the churches', that is to say, how Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians could be reconciled.[4] Convened by imperial initiative, the conversations can be regarded as exceptional as both sides were forced to approach the matter seriously beyond rhetorical discourses and empty accusations. Both parties, especially the non-Chalcedonians, were to come up with a practical solution as to how the split between the two groups could be healed and a union be reached. Knowing their goals, scholars may turn the issue on its head and ask the opposite: what did the two parties in 532/3 regard as the real cause for the division? How did the non-Chalcedonian bishops explain their escape from their communities in 519/22 and why did they start to establish a church?

Peter Brown has recently dismissed the notion that the controversies following Chalcedon could be explained purely in social or even nationalistic terms.[5] He rightly remarks that the 'religious issue of the closeness of God to humanity was serious enough, in and of itself'.[6] A controversy, however, does not inevitably lead to the foundation of a separate church—or even churches—as happened eventually in post-Chalcedonian times. It may therefore be suggested that an issue beyond the Christological question caused the final break. The discussion over Chalcedon increasingly became a controversy over persons, and the commemoration of these persons in local churches. It seems that when the pope sent his *libellus* to the East, requesting to purify the diptychs of names regarded to have been heretics by the

Mass.: Harvard University Press 1940, 80f. The non-Chalcedonian bishops stayed for one year according to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 122 (Brooks, 84; Hamilton and Brooks, 253). The date of the debate is not entirely clear (532 or 533), see Ernest Stein, *Histoire du bas-empire II*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer 1949, 378 n. 1; see also F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigekeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster i.W.: Aschendorff 1899, 36; *idem*, *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1938, 112–14 (Diekamp opts for spring 533).

[4] Brock, 'The Conversations', 114; Brock calls this short Syriac summary S; here S3 (Brock, 114); see also Brock, 'The Conversations', 110f.

[5] The classic essay remains A. H. M. Jones, 'Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?' *JThS* n.s. 10 (1959), 280–98. See also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972.

[6] P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England 2001, 107.

papacy, the pope caused the step which led to the establishment of a separate non-Chalcedonian church in the East.

In 532/3 Justinian regarded the Chalcedonians as the church of the empire and privileged them in the audiences; the non-Chalcedonians, however, could freely offer their opinion and were granted permission to leave Constantinople even if there were no agreement. Both parties made careful preparations for the sessions in order to ensure that their side might win the discussions.[7] The debate was intended to be informal and not open to the public:[8] neither Justinian nor the patriarch of Constantinople, Epiphanius, took part in them, but both had confidants who attended the sessions and could report back.[9] Both sides took minutes of the sessions which, although biased, provide scholars with an excellent documentation of the event.[10] The Chalcedonian account in the form of a letter by the bishop Innocentius of Maronia to Thomas of Thessalonica has long been known, but the non-Chalcedonian accounts were more recently (re)discovered:[11] in addition to a translation of a neglected short Syriac summary Sebastian Brock has edited and translated a Syriac document that—although lacking beginning and end—can function as a non-Chalcedonian companion to the detailed account by Innocentius.[12] Furthermore Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor preserves a statement of faith, the 'plerophoria', which the non-Chalcedonian bishops handed in to Justinian.[13]

[7] The Syriac author of the report H remarks once with satisfaction that the inability of the Chalcedonians to refute one of their opponents' claims 'was apparent to the auditor and to all those who were present'; Brock, 'The Conversations', 104f.

[8] It almost seems to have been a prelude to the visit of Severus in Constantinople. See Chapter 5.

[9] *ACO* IV.2, 170; Brock, 'The Conversations', 92. Furthermore, Ephrem of Amida, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, had confidants in the conversations, and also the non-Chalcedonians had brought along monks and clergy; *ACO* IV.2, 170.

[10] Already noted by Brock, 'The Conversations', 87f., and Speigl, 'Das Religionsgespräch', 265.

[11] Innocentius of Maronia's letter survives in a Latin translation and is edited by Schwartz, in *ACO* IV.2, 169–84.

[12] The Syriac summary is edited by F. Nau, in *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'église nestorienne, PO* 13, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1919, 192–6. Brock, 'The Conversations', 88 n. 6 notes its neglect and provides an English translation (113–17). See also Brock's preliminary presentation: 'The Orthodox–Oriental Conversations of 532', *Apostolos Varnavas* 41 (1980), 219–27.

[13] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 115–23 (Brooks, 79–84; Hamilton and Brooks, 246–52); called *Plerophoria* in H1 (Brock, 'The Conversations', 92f.).

Hypatius of Ephesus was the head of the Chalcedonian delegation, John of Tella may have been the leader of the non-Chalcedonians.[14] The debate itself—excluding the audiences the two groups had with the emperor before and afterwards—lasted only two days. It seems therefore reasonable to assume that both sides would go immediately *in medias res* and present their view of the natures of Christ, but a modern reader who expects a lofty philosophical discussion is sincerely disappointed.[15] Rather than a discussion about divine matters and the scriptures—as hearers could expect for example in public disputations in the fourth century between Christians and Manichaeans—the participants remained in the human sphere and focused on holy fathers and their texts.[16] The entire first day was spent on Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria (444–51), who was held in high honour among non-Chalcedonians. He had presided over the Council of Ephesus II (449) and was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. As his role in accepting Eutyches—on whom both sides agreed that he was a heretic—into communion at the Council of Ephesus II was not above suspicion, the non-Chalcedonians themselves felt uneasy. According to Innocentius, the non-Chalcedonian bishops had to admit that Dioscorus' behaviour had justified, after all, the convention of a new council—the Council of Chalcedon.[17] As the Syriac account glances over this part with the

[14] For Hypatius of Ephesus see: Diekamp, *Analecta Patristica*, 109–60, and A. Grillmeier, *Jesus, der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989, 242–62. Hypatius appears also in an unpublished Syriac Letter: Thomas of Germanicia, 'Letter to Presbyter John of Mar Eusebius': British Museum Add. 14532, fols. 142a–143a. It is not persuasive that Sergius of Cyrrhus, about whom we know nothing, was the leader of the non-Chalcedonians as Speigl, 'Das Religionsgespräch', 273, and Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 247, assume, based on the fact that Sergius is mentioned first in S (Brock, 'The Conversations', 113). It seems more likely that John of Tella headed the non-Chalcedonian delegation as he was at that time not only the most active non-Chalcedonian bishop (he ordained priests since maybe 522/3; see Chapter 4), but also the most prominent non-Chalcedonian bishop and an able theologian (see his letter: BL Add. 14549, fols. 219b–226b, Chapter 4). Already J. A. S. Evans, *The Empress Theodora: Partner of Justinian*, Austin: University of Texas Press 2002, 75, calls him the 'principal clergy' in the debates.

[15] Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 247, is disappointed that the participants did not focus on theological problems ('Doch die Enttäuschung ist groß').

[16] R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1995, 70–108.

[17] Innocentius 18; *ACO* IV.2, 171.

short note that the Chalcedonian bishops should 'reserve those words [concerning Dioscorus] and the discussion of them for the proper time', the non-Chalcedonian bishops apparently felt forced to admit that the Council of Chalcedon was convened for a reason.[18] But the non-Chalcedonians could also celebrate a triumph on the first day: the Chalcedonians, in turn, admitted that they 'do not hold him [Dioscorus] to be a heretic, for his opinions were orthodox'—a fact omitted in Innocentius' account.[19]

After the two parties had established unofficially—as no official records were made—that Dioscorus was orthodox and the Council of Chalcedon as such was justified, the conversations could move on to a detailed discussion of the Christology of Chalcedon. As in the sixth century 'theology was to be an enterprise that worked, not with ideas, but with the authoritative sources', the participants' discussion was based on the examination of texts.[20] Both sides tried to claim the apostolic past and the 'holy fathers' for their cause.[21]

On the second day the non-Chalcedonian bishops were allowed to read out their 'plerophoria', their statement of faith, which they had already handed in to Justinian before.[22] Here, the non-Chalcedonian bishops acknowledged that they had received 'the faith of the apostles' from their 'earliest infancy', and believed in the first three ecumenical councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus (I).[23] Defining this faith, the non-Chalcedonians disassociated themselves from Apollinaris, Mani, Eutyches, and Nestorius, and based themselves on Dionysius the Areopagite, Paul, Athanasius, and—generally speaking—'our (holy) fathers'. Therefore they 'ought to confess one nature of God the Word', and their opponents should refute the *Tome*

[18] Brock, 'The Conversations', 96f. However, the non-Chalcedonians did not agree that the decisions made at Chalcedon were acceptable; Grillmeier *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 248 n. 32.

[19] Brock, 'The Conversations', 96f. Dioscorus was deposed at Chalcedon, but no explicit judgement was pronounced concerning his orthodoxy; see *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. iii, trans. M. Gaddis and R. Price, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005, 29–116.

[20] Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', 29f.

[21] Athanasius was *the* father of orthodoxy; see below and Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', 23, but also the Cappadocians were cited by both sides.

[22] H12; Brock, 'The Conversations', 96f. Innocentius does not mention this.

[23] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 115–22 (Brooks, 79–84; Hamilton and Brooks, 246–52).

of Leo, Nestorius, Theodore (of Mopsuestia), Diodore (of Tarsus), Theodoret (of Cyrrhus), and the Council of Chalcedon. Dioscorus had cried out at the Council of Chalcedon, 'I am being thrown out with the fathers?'[24] Similarly, in 532/3, the non-Chalcedonians placed themselves in the tradition of these fathers and perceived anyone else like the Chalcedonians as being 'subject to punishment and blame from our holy fathers'.[25] Claiming for themselves to be faithful to the texts of the fathers and therefore to 'the faith of the apostles', they blamed the Chalcedonians for innovating a new faith at Chalcedon.

According to the Syriac account, the Chalcedonian bishops did not judge the 'plerophoria', but asked the non-Chalcedonians to lay out what they believed to be the faults of Chalcedon. '[A]bove all else', the non-Chalcedonian bishops answered, that Chalcedon has accepted Ibas (who had been an extreme dyophysite bishop of Edessa) and Theodoret as orthodox.[26] Ibas and what he wrote in his letter to Mari obviously posed an embarrassment for the Chalcedonians, but as the documentation was there, they could not argue against it. Only then followed an 'examination of faith' as the Syriac text calls it, and what makes up the whole second day in Innocentius' account.[27] The non-Chalcedonians called upon two of Cyril's letters, and asked to have them read out. As the Chalcedonians refused this because these letters had not been confirmed by the council (of Ephesus I), the non-Chalcedonians reminded them that Gregory of Nazianzus had called '"the law of the orthodox" all that had been written by Athanasius [...] despite the fact that these (works) had not been confirmed by the synod' of Ephesus (I).[28] Only then did the Chalcedonians allow the non-Chalcedonians to read out the letter to Eulogius.[29] As the day was almost over, the Chalcedonian bishops were

[24] *ACO* II.1.1, 117 (quoted from Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', 28).

[25] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 122 (Brooks, 84; Hamilton and Brooks, 252).

[26] H14; Brock, 'The Conversations', 98f.

[27] H24; Brock, 'The Conversations', 104f.; Innocentius 21–78; *ACO* IV.2, 171–82.

[28] From the context it seems obvious that the non-Chalcedonians refer here to Ephesus I even though 'the synod' is not named in this section of the text; H28; Brock, 'The Conversations', 104–7.

[29] The other letter, however, to Acacius of Melitene was not read because the chair of the conversations, Strategius, reminded the non-Chalcedonians that it would contain basically the same argument, and much of the day had already passed by.

asked to prepare their texts for the next day, and they promised that they would bring proof-texts from the holy fathers 'that they spoke of two natures with reference to Christ'.[30]

Since the emperor ended the conversations the next day this never happened, and the non-Chalcedonians remarked triumphantly that 'indeed they could not have done so'.[31] Despite this imputation, the Chalcedonians were probably as well prepared for the debates as the non-Chalcedonians. In his long account on the second day, Innocentius insists that the Chalcedonian bishops brought forth their proof-texts and the non-Chalcedonians finally agreed to them; this claim, however, cannot be verified and Alois Grillmeier already remarked that Innocentius probably recorded only what the Chalcedonian party had prepared and wished to have used against the non-Chalcedonians.[32] The Chalcedonians seem to have been taken as much by surprise about Justinian's abrupt ending of the debate as the non-Chalcedonians.

Innocentius documented meticulously what the Chalcedonian bishops wanted to bring into the discussion. He not only mentions whom they would have read out, but brought excerpts into his account by Flavian, bishop of Constantinople (446–9), and by Cyril from his letters to Nestorius and to John, patriarch of Antioch (429–42). It is obvious that Cyril was the cornerstone of orthodoxy for both sides, but 'different Cyrils' were employed. Patrick Gray remarks that the controversy over Chalcedon in the sixth century took place 'between conservative Cyrillians who accepted Chalcedon and conservative Cyrillians who did not'.[33] Apart from the fact that the two sides obviously presented different texts, the hermeneutic approach in discussing Christology was the same. It was paramount for Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians in order to justify

[30] H31; Brock, 'The Conversations', 106f.

[31] H34; Brock, 'The Conversations', 108f.

[32] Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. ii/2, 254.

[33] P. Gray, 'Neo-Chalcedonianism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine Theology', *ByzF* 8 (1982), 62. The first scholar who established the importance of pre-Chalcedonian Cyrillism in non-Chalcedonian theology was J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique*, Leuven: van Linthout 1909, and *idem*, 'La Christologie du Monophysisme Syrien', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 425–580.

their cause that they based their argument on texts by certain famous 'holy fathers', that is to say, select theologians of the fourth and fifth centuries which were accepted by both sides. Since their texts differed, however, it might be allowed to refine Gray's terminology, who speaks of 'select fathers', and refer here to select texts from select fathers.[34]

Averil Cameron's and Patrick Gray's works demonstrate that 'the appeal to the past becomes critical',[35] and that this approach to theology is a development of the sixth century in general.[36] Both parties collected texts or passages from the fathers and brought them together in *Florilegia.* These 'collections of flowers' developed a dynamic of their own: they were not only employed by the side which had produced them, but also by the opposing party, which referred to them in order to refute them or to find forgeries among the 'proof-texts'.[37] According to Innocentius, Hypatius, the head of the Chalcedonians, questioned some proof-texts of the non-Chalcedonians in

[34] See Gray, 'Select Fathers', 21, who takes this quote about the 'select fathers' who are not at variance with themselves nor their peers with respect to the intended sense of the faith from Leontius of Jerusalem, *Testimonies of the Saints*, now edited by Gray in Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites*: Testimonies of the Saints *and* Aporiae, ed. and trans. P. T. R. Gray, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006, 104f. D. Krausmüller in his article 'Leontius of Jerusalem, a Theologian of the Seventh Century', *JThS* 52 (2001), 637–57, dates Leontius to the seventh century, but Gray refutes Krausmüller's argument in his above-mentioned recent edition: Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites*, 38–40; Gray dates Leontius' *Testimonies of the Saints* between 536 and 538.

Also Leontius speaks of 'specific texts of the select Fathers' (Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites*, 60f.).

[35] Av. Cameron, 'Models of the Past in the Late Sixth Century: The Life of the Patriarch Eutychius', in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Clarke, Canberra: Australian National University Press 1990, 206.

[36] See articles above, and also P. Gray, 'An Anonymous Severian Monophysite of the Mid-Sixth Century', *PBR* 1 (1982), 117–26; *idem*, 'Neo-Chalcedonianism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine Theology', *ByzF* 8 (1982), 61–70; *idem*, 'Through the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem: The Sixth-Century Transformation of Theology', in *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, ed. P. Allen and E. M. Jeffreys, Byzantina Australiensia 10, Brisbane 1996, 187–96.

[37] Some of the *florilegia* have only survived through fragments in their refutations; for Chalcedonian *florilegia* see M. Richards, 'Les florilèges diphysites du Ve et du VIe siècle', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 721–48; for forgeries see P. Gray, 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century', *BZ* 81 (1988), 284–9.

532/3 as possibly Apollinarian forgeries.[38] The Syrian author remains silent about this, but focuses, instead, on the unquestioned texts of Cyril. Cyril's words were authoritative for both sides because the imprecise nature of the terminology Cyril used in his letters—or rather the change of his terminology over the years—could be exploited by Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians.[39] Cyril's canonization culminated in the fifth ecumenical council in 553 when Justinian requested to have Theodoret condemned because by supporting the views of Theodore and Nestorius, Theodoret blasphemed against Cyril. 'To speak against Cyril was now blasphemy!'[40] According to both sides, therefore, any decision on theology in the present needed to be examined according to whether it agreed with the texts of the fathers. In other words, Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians alike employed their Christian tradition as normative for constructing theology in the sixth century.

For the time being Justinian had heard enough. He was only interested in what the non-Chalcedonians had to say, whereas he was familiar with the arguments of the Chalcedonians through the Chalcedonian bishops at court. The emperor had been monitoring the debate closely, and after a meeting with the Chalcedonian bishops alone, he called in the non-Chalcedonians for a final review of the debate. The non-Chalcedonian bishops assured the emperor that not only through their 'plerophoria', but also in the two days of discussion they had proved those wrong who believed that the non-Chalcedonians were not orthodox.[41] Justinian's answer that he was 'not of the opinion, either, that you do not think in an orthodox fashion, but you do not want to communicate out of excessive (scruples) over detail, and because of (certain) names which have been put on the diptychs' must come to the unbiased reader somewhat as a surprise.[42] Had these bishops not been in exile for more than a decade for dogmatic reasons,

[38] Innocentius 24f.; *ACO* IV.2, 172f.: Hypatius discovered that letters by the Popes Julius (337–52) and Felix (*c.*268/9–273/4) were forgeries. For Apollinaris of Laodicea see G. Feige, 'Apollinaris of Laodizea', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 48–50.

[39] Radical non-Chalcedonians, however, blamed Cyril for his terminology; see Severus, *Collection of Letters* 39, Brooks, 297.

[40] *ACO* IV.1, 13. Gray, '"The Select Fathers"', 30.

[41] H35; Brock, 'The Conversations', 108f.

[42] Brock, 'The Conversations', 108.

that is, for not accepting the dyophysite Christology of the Council of Chalcedon? Why would fifty-four bishops, if not stigmatized as heretics, leave their sees?[43]

THE *LIBELLUS* OF HORMISDAS

In the first audience with Justinian before the debate the non-Chalcedonian bishops were blamed for leaving their sees. The non-Chalcedonians, however, in return blamed Pope Hormisdas, saying that in his *libellus*:[44]

A new sentence has come on the church, and this was the cause of our departure; for *libelli* were given to us all to put our signature to, (*libelli*) in which we were required to anathematize ourselves and those who were our fathers—and indeed more or less the entire world. For to anathematize Peter, archbishop of Antioch and all who remain in communion with him, and Acacius of Constantinople and Peter of Alexandria, as well as those who persevere in communion with them, (this) is nothing than to anathematize ourselves, and, as it were, everything under the sky.[45]

[43] For the number of non-Chalcedonian bishops in exile see: *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 17f. (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies: Toronto 1999, 50f.): fifty-three names are given, but the non-Chalcedonian bishops Philoxenus of Doliche and Cassian of Bostra are not mentioned. Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.13; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901, 266f. (170–3) names fifty-two who followed Severus 'and many others'. See also Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, *Chronicle Part III*, trans. W. Witakowski, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1996, 19 n. 122. The same list, but with more details for some bishops, can be found in *Chronica Minora*, vol. ii, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 3, 4, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955, 225–8 (171–3). For the question of how complete this list is see E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951, 76f., 82f., and 145–8. It is highly doubtful that the non-Chalcedonians left out many from the list as they obviously tried to be as inclusive as possible to demonstrate their strength and the unpopularity of the imperial policy.

[44] This first audience with Justinian before the debate is lacking in H completely, whereas the audience after the debate unfortunately breaks off in the middle. Innocentius records only the audience between the Chalcedonian bishops and the emperor before the debate (Innocentius 4f.; *ACO* IV.2, 169).

[45] Translation in Brock, 'The Conversations', 113f.

This papal *libellus* to which the non-Chalcedonians referred was a carefully crafted document originally written in 515 which first of all postulated Rome's authority in matters of faith. It proclaimed Chalcedon from a western perspective by outlawing the eastern post-Chalcedonian past and theological developments. It established a heresiology from Eutyches-Dioscorus to the later patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch which probably no easterner—neither Chalcedonian nor non-Chalcedonian—would have drawn. It requested that the names of these heretics should no longer be read out at the altar when the Eucharist was celebrated, that is to say, that the names of heretics were to be erased from the diptychs. At the same time, the *libellus* was a flexible document by leaving some loose ends in the present in order to make it as inclusive as possible so that any living bishop might accept Rome's dictate and stay in office. It is necessary to outline the document in some detail.

In this *libellus* Pope Hormisdas claims, that the 'words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said: *Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church*, may not be ignored is proved by the result: because in the Apostolic See religion has always been kept immaculate'.[46] Thereby Hormisdas claims Matthew 16:18, Peter as the rock of the church, as well as an orthodox past for Rome since the time of the apostles. He put himself in this tradition by following the fathers and anathematizing all heretics. Referring to the pre-Chalcedonian past, Hormisdas condemns the arch-heretic Nestorius, 'who was at one time Bishop of the city of Constantinople, who was condemned in the Council of Ephesus by Celestine, Pope of the city of Rome, and by Saint Cyril, Bishop of the city of Alexandria'.[47] By remarking that Nestorius had been bishop of Constantinople, Hormisdas reminds the eastern capital that their own see had gone astray and only Rome and Alexandria retained the true faith. In fact, he brings the papacy here in line with Cyril, who had been first and foremost responsible

[46] Quoted from A. Fortescue, *The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas*, Garrison, NY: National Office, Chair of Unity Octave 1955, 15. See also Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 167f. For the different versions of the *libellus* see Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 764f., and Haacke, *Glaubensformel*, 9–14.

[47] Quoted from Fortescue, *Reunion Formula*, 15. Note that part of his text (and therefore also his translation)—especially the part referring to the followers of Acacius—is not identical with the edition of Guenther, *Coll. Avell.* 116b, which is authoritative and referred to here otherwise.

for the outcome of Ephesus I, not Pope Celestine. By coupling this uneven pair, Hormisdas virtually downplays Cyril's primary importance and dominance. The next sentence leaves no doubt that only Rome remained permanently faithful: Hormisdas condemns Eutyches, the heretical archimandrite from Constantinople, and Dioscorus, the former patriarch of Alexandria, pairing the two and plainly stating that Chalcedon had already condemned them—although only Eutyches had explicitly been condemned for heresy (in 448, confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon), but not Dioscorus.[48]

Furthermore, Hormisdas anathematizes also the eastern post-Chalcedonian past by condemning a number of eastern post-Chalcedonian patriarchs: the former non-Chalcedonian patriarchs of Alexandria Timothy Aelurus (457–60; 475–7) and Peter Mongus (477; 482–9), Peter the Fuller, former non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (469/70; 470/1; 475/6; 485–8) as well as Acacius, former Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople (472–89) and those who remained in communion with them.[49] All those 'are not to be recited in the holy mysteries', in other words, they should be erased from the diptychs.[50] Hormisdas is here in line with Pope Gelasius I (492–6), who argued with Constantinople that Timothy Aelurus, Peter Mongus, and Peter the Fuller had been deposed by the apostolic see.[51] Although eastern Chalcedonians would hardly have had an interest in referring to Gelasius, they probably would have agreed on a condemnation of these non-Chalcedonians. Acacius' appearance in this list, however, condemned in his lifetime by Pope Felix III (483–92), posed a problem for eastern Chalcedonians. Gelasius had argued that the papacy had the right to condemn him because he was in communion with 'Eutychians', that is, in Gelasius' terminology, the non-Chalcedonian patriarch Peter Mongus. The argument of Acacius' successors that a patriarch cannot be deposed without a proper council was refuted by Gelasius' assertion that every heresy can only be condemned by one

[48] See above n. 19.

[49] The part of the *libellus* concerning Acacius which reads 'who was condemned by the Apostolic See' is left out in the *libellus* which the patriarch of Constantinople, John II, sent back to Hormisdas at the end of March 519 as part of his letter: *Coll. Avell.* 159. See below.

[50] *Coll. Avell.* 116b; Fortescue, *Reunion Formula*, 16. For the diptychs see below.

[51] Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 57f.

council. Since Chalcedon had confirmed the condemnation of Eutyches, Acacius was automatically anathematized as an associate of a condemned heretic.[52]

The fine difference between the clear condemnation of Eutyches as a heretic, and the deposition of Dioscorus for improperly conducting the Council of Ephesus II, most likely deliberately, eluded the papal perception.[53] Building on this postulation, the *libellus* neatly shows how a heresiology was established step by step. From Eutyches and Dioscorus the 'disease'—in fact called a 'plague' by Hormisdas—infected the whole East.[54] Antioch was infected through Peter the Fuller, Alexandria through Timothy Aelurus and his successor Peter Mongus, Constantinople because it was in communion with Peter Mongus.[55]

But the *libellus* also reveals some gaps. Nothing is said about the non-Chalcedonian followers of Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus. This might be due to the fact that the papal legates to Constantinople were drawn into discussion about faith with legates from the patriarch in Alexandria in 497. As the papal legates accepted a copy of the *Henoticon* from them and promised to deliver it to Pope Anastasius II (496–8), the papacy had dealt with heretics. Hormisdas probably did not want to bring up this issue in order to avoid the impression that the apostolic see had acted any less than immaculate in the past.[56]

The *libellus* also does not specify who the followers of Acacius or Peter the Fuller were. Neither Timothy of Constantinople nor Severus are mentioned, although at least the latter was certainly

[52] Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 58f.

[53] Chalcedon had avoided a judgement about Dioscorus' orthodoxy, but the popes had probably always questioned the orthodoxy of his miaphysitism. Already one of Gelasius' predecessors, Simplicius (468–83), had paired Eutyches and Dioscorus (see A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/1, Freiburg: Herder, 2nd edn. 1991, 281), and as early as 454 the emperor Marcian called Dioscorus an adherent to Eutychianism; see *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. iii, Gaddis and Price, 33.

[54] *Coll. Avell.* 120.8: Hormisdas speaks of a 'regionem quandam pestiferam'.

[55] Pope Anastasius II tried to reconcile the schism with Constantinople on the basis that Acacius could not be commemorated not because he was a heretic, but because he did not die in communion with the pope. Thereby Acacius appears 'only' as schismatic, but also this attempt was futile; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 83f., Haacke, *Glaubensformel*, 65f.

[56] See F. K. Haarer, *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, ARCA 46, Cambridge: Francis Cairns 2006, 132, although it is not possible to speak of a real union here between Rome and Alexandria.

high on the papal list of heretics. This may be explained by the uncomfortable circumstances in which Hormisdas had first drawn up his *libellus* in 515. More conciliatory than his predecessor Pope Symmachus (498–514),[57] Hormisdas might have hoped for a union when the emperor Anastasius had invited him to the Council of Heraclea in 515.[58] He wished to achieve a union on papal terms, that is to say, on the one hand, acceptance of Chalcedon and the letters of Leo and on the other hand, condemnation of all deceased opponents of the papacy. But Hormisdas also knew that Anastasius, who had reigned in schism with Rome since 491, could hardly be in favour of this. It was under Anastasius that the non-Chalcedonian Severus had become patriarch of Antioch only three years earlier in 512. Therefore, Hormisdas would have acted unwisely to include Timothy and Severus as heretics in his *libellus*, as this would have forced Anastasius to drop immediately the two most influential religious leaders in his empire.[59] Even in case Anastasius sought reconciliation with Rome, such far-reaching requests would have united eastern Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians in opposition to the papacy (and then Anastasius). Why should the emperor stir up the supporters of these patriarchs in order to satisfy the will of a pope who resided outside his imperial realm?

Hormisdas might have borne that in mind, as in his correspondence with Constantinople, he never dared to condemn a living patriarch.[60] In 515 the pope did not condemn the present patriarch Timothy right away, but expected a future trial to take place on the situation of the patriarchate of Constantinople.[61] Hormisdas asked Anastasius to accept the *libellus* as the pre-request before the pope would come to the East and attend the council of Heraclea. The

[57] F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1958, 126.

[58] Forced by Vitalian, Anastasius had invited Hormisdas to attend a council in July 515; see J. Speigl, 'Die Synode von Heraklea 515', *AHC* 12 (1980), 47–61.

[59] Probably neither Timothy's theological abilities nor his leadership can be compared to Severus', but his position as patriarch of the capital made him influential.

[60] Similarly seventeen years later Pope Agapetus defended papal jurisdiction in Illyria against Constantinople by putting the blame on the recently deceased patriarch Epiphanius 'ad personam'. J. Hofmann, 'Der hl. Papst Agapit I. und die Kirche von Byzanz', *OstKSt* 40 (1991), 118.

[61] About the unclear dogmatic position of Timothy see Chapter 1.

pope also reserved the right to judge the patriarch of Constantinople, and on the issue of exiled Chalcedonian bishops (Macedonius *et alii*) as well as of bishops who had—according to the pope—persecuted Chalcedonians.[62]

After Anastasius had abandoned the idea of a council in 515, Hormisdas tried to lobby for his policy against the emperor. He had been successful in some parts of the East, and tried now to stir up more support for his cause.[63] However, his diplomacy ended in disaster for the papacy. An enraged emperor told Hormisdas that '[w]e can bear insults and contempt, but we cannot permit ourselves to be commanded'.[64] After this incident correspondence between Rome and Constantinople stopped, and it must have become obvious to Hormisdas how crucial the support of the emperor and the capital was in order to achieve anything in the East.

In 518, when the accession of Justin was announced and Chalcedon became accepted in Constantinople, Hormisdas acted very cautiously. He answered politely, but let the emperor know that the acceptance of the *libellus* was his requirement for communion.[65] From a letter by Justinian he knew that Constantinople had studied his earlier correspondence with Anastasius and knew the *libellus.* Hormisdas would now not withdraw from it, but if he wished to come to terms with the new emperor, he also could not raise the bar. The pope could, however, change the *indiculi,* that is, the instructions for his legates.[66]

In 515 Hormisdas still insisted that his legates should not allow the easterners to call Macedonius, the former patriarch of Constantinople who had been deposed by Anastasius in 512 (but was still alive

[62] *Coll. Avell.* 116 and 116a.

[63] See Haacke, *Die Glaubensformel,* 72 with n. 11, for the areas in which Hormisdas had been successful; F. Hofmann, 'Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon von Leo dem Großen bis Hormisdas (451–519)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart,* vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 80–2.

[64] *Coll. Avell.* 138; quoted from P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518,* Byzantina Keimena Kai Meletai 11, Thessalonica: Kentron Byzantinon Ereunon 1974, 105. Caspar, *Papsttum,* vol. ii, 146.

[65] *Coll. Avell.* 144.

[66] Furthermore, in early 518 he had already anathematized Severus in a letter to Chalcedonian monks from Syria. *Coll. Avell.* 140. See below.

according to the knowledge of the pope), a heretic.[67] Four years later in 519, when Macedonius had died, the pope expected the easterners to erase the memory of this Chalcedonian patriarch. In fact, Hormisdas instructed his legates now to condemn all deceased successors of Acacius including those who suffered exile for their defence of the Council of Chalcedon.[68] The only compromise the legates were allowed to make was that the names of staunch defenders of Chalcedon like Euphemius and Macedonius were erased tacitly from the diptychs. The present patriarch John II, although already ordained under Anastasius and of questionable orthodoxy, was again not targeted.

It is worth noting here that no general council which would have performed a formal reunion between Rome and Constantinople was convened. In a letter from 7 September 518, Justinian had asked Hormisdas to come to the East as soon as possible in order to settle the issue over Acacius.[69] As Hormisdas did not reply to Justinian's request, but required the emperor to accept the *libellus*, the court in Constantinople understood that this *libellus* would be the pope's final word. The request to come to the East was not renewed, but the emperor and Justinian seem to have desperately waited for the papal legates to arrive in Constantinople in order to establish the union. Finally, on 25 March 519, the legates arrived, and only three days later—in which the emperor forced his patriarch to sign the, for the patriarch, humiliating *libellus*—the papal requests were met and a union with Rome established.[70]

It is surprising that after thirty-six years of schism no general council was held in order to discuss how much agreement there was between Chalcedonians in East and West, how the different theological developments could fit in one post- and pro-Chalcedonian church, and to clarify the conditions of a church union. In the short run, however, it may not have been in the best interest of either side to do so. First of all, the emperor wished a fast reunion with Rome in order

[67] *Coll. Avell.* 116. For the *indiculi* see also A. Gillett, *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003, 227–9, who is, however, interested in the ceremonial procedure rather than the religious controversy.

[68] *Coll. Avell.* 158.

[69] *Coll. Avell.* 147.

[70] Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 155–8. Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 175–8; see Frend, *Monophysite Movement*, 238.

to enhance his own prestige and legitimize his claim to be a Chalcedonian emperor. A general council would have delayed the union for a considerable amount of time, but some decisions needed immediate attention and could not wait until a general council was convened. The patriarchal see of Antioch was vacant after Severus' departure, and it was crucial that a replacement would be found soon. The emperor needed a patriarch here whom the papacy accepted, as a later papal refutation of a newly ordained patriarch here could jeopardize the reunion and destabilize Justin's rule.[71]

In fact, even the outcome of a general council could not be guaranteed. The patriarch of Constantinople, supported by many Chalcedonians in the East, could prepare a stronger defence of Acacius and his followers against papal accusations than he was allowed to make on 27/8 March 519, when Justin made him sign the *libellus*. A debate about the theopaschite formula which was already in the air might have further delayed a union. Considering that Justin had not been the first choice for the throne, the new emperor desparately wished an agreement with Rome to back up his policy.

A general council may not have been in the best interest of the pope either. At such a council, the alleged heresy of Acacius would have been discussed, and the papal construction of a heresiology stemming from Eutyches might have been questioned—especially if non-Chalcedonian bishops who were still in power in the East would have attended the council. Furthermore, if Acacius was discussed in detail, someone also might point out the questionable behaviour of the papal legates in 497 as discussed above, and the even more debatable actions of some papal legates under Felix III (483–492), who celebrated mass with Acacius in 483.[72] Although the papacy could claim that Felix's legates were forced by Acacius, and after their return to Rome they were put on trial, if easterners brought up these cases, the papacy would not look as 'immaculate' as Hormisdas had claimed. Therefore, as long as the emperor supported his *libellus*, this was everything Hormisdas could hope for.

Justin was requested to accept Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo, and to announce this change of religious policy officially in all provinces

[71] See Chapter 1. [72] Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 29–32.

of his empire.[73] Hormisdas had in mind a combination of imperial law and his *libellus*. The clergy—or at least the bishops who would be responsible for the lower clergy in their dioceses—[74] should sign the papal *libellus* while the *sacra generalis*, the imperial letter, made the pope's request legally binding on all subjects of the empire.[75] What had shocked the papacy in 482 about the *Henoticon*—that a definition of faith had been imposed by imperial edict—the papacy now tried to use for its own ends.[76] From a papal perspective the difference was that the papacy had the *auctoritas* to declare what the right faith was, whereas the emperor only had the *potestas* to enforce it.[77] All bishops should sign the *libellus* as 'my profession [which] I have signed with my own hand and offer to thee, Hormisdas, holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome'.[78] By implementing the *libellus* together with an imperial edict, the faith of Rome was unquestionably accepted, and thereby the primacy of Rome established also in the East. It was more than a general council could ever possibly have done for the papacy.[79]

The enforcement of the papal *libellus* did not go as swiftly as the pope might have wished. Justin had severe problems in implementing it: a main obstacle was posed by the *libellus*' request that the names of deceased but revered bishops whom the papal *libellus* now declared heretics were to be erased from the diptychs. The diptychs seem to form a crucial, but also underestimated issue in the history of the split of the non-Chalcedonians. It is therefore necessary to focus on the function and the use of the diptychs before 518.

[73] These were the papal requests in 515, but apparently did not change in 519; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 136.

[74] The papal legates, however, asked in 519 also the archimandrites of Constantinople to sign the *libellus*—probably in order to give them no excuses to break communion with their bishops. From the reaction of the archimandrites—who suggested that it would be sufficient if their bishops would sign the *libellus*—the papal legates did well; *Coll. Avell.* 167.12.

[75] *Coll. Avell.* 116 and 116a. Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 133f. See for example Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 55 (Ghanem, 64f.): the nobles of Tella waited for the imperial edict which proclaimed Chalcedon.

[76] For the *Henoticon* see Haarer, *Anastasius I*, 123–6, 130f.

[77] This famous division was most notably developed by Pope Gelasius I; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 63–7.

[78] *Coll. Avell.* 116b; Fortescue, *Reunion Formula*, 16.

[79] For predecessors of the *libellus* see Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. i, 225f. and 501f.

THE DIPTYCHS

The diptychs formed an important part of the liturgy, a liturgical unit that commemorated the names of dead and living persons.[80] They were read out by the deacon 'at the time of the consecration (*tempore consecrationis*)' of the Eucharist.[81] There seems to have been no general rule as to who could be included in the diptychs of a church, but they usually included among the living the clergy of the particular church whose names were to be read out in hierarchical order.[82] The dead included probably on a general level saints (martyrs and apostles) and, more precisely, a list of deceased bishops of the particular city.[83] Nevertheless, because of the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries the question arose: who was worthy of commemoration? Who needed to be erased? It seems that these questions were a hotly debated topic in the East. Often compromises were made in order to overcome the tension between a community's pride or devotion for a deceased, local bishop and the question of his orthodoxy. Furthermore, even if this bishop was no longer regarded as orthodox, a widespread hesitation remained about erasing the name of such a person if he had died in communion with the church.[84] Already before Chalcedon the eastern churches were concerned about the issue of how inclusive or exclusive the diptychs should be. Cyril advised fellow bishops to act wisely and not to be too strict. In the same way, eighty years later, Severus was hesitant to promote strictly 'confessional diptychs', that is

[80] For diptychs in general see H. Leclerq, 'Diptyques', in *DACL* IV.1, 1045–1170; J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus*, vol. iii, Rome: Apud Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregorianae 1932, 479f.; and R. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. iv: *The Diptychs*, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1991.

[81] *Coll. Avell.* 146.4. Taft, *Diptychs*, 6, states that the diptychs were read out before or during the anaphora, the Eucharistic prayer.

[82] Severus, *Select Letters* I.7 and I.46, Brooks, 44 (40) and 142 (127).

[83] No diptychs from the sixth century survive, and also for the seventh century only evidence from Egypt exists; see W. E. Crum, 'A Greek Diptych of the Seventh Century', *PSBA* 30 (1908), 255–65; O. Stegmüller, 'Christliche Texte aus der Berliner Papyrussammlung', *Aeg* 17 (1937), 452–62.

[84] The dead receive increasing attention in recent years; see U. Volp, *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*, Leiden: Brill 2002, and for late antiquity É. Rebillard, *Religion et Sépulture. L'Église, les vivants et les morts dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales 2003, especially 172–97.

to say, diptychs which were cleaned of any suspicious bishop of the past.[85] But individual bishops and their churches seemed to have different understandings about how inclusive or exclusive the naming in the diptychs should have been. This development will be discussed here, leading up to the state of the church when the *libellus* of Hormisdas was enforced in the East.

Concerning the living, it may be comparatively easy to answer the question of who would be put into the diptychs: in addition to the bishop of the particular city, the diptychs included the names of higher clergy with whom the local bishop was in communion.[86] For example, in the case of a patriarchal see like Constantinople it was Peter Mongus, non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, whose name was read out (among others) from the diptychs in 483.[87] After emperor Anastasius' death, Hormisdas was included in the diptychs of the capital even before the union of 519 as a sign of goodwill and hope that a union would be reached.[88]

Which names of the dead should be included in the diptychs was problematic. Surviving diptychs from Coptic Egypt show that Severus of Antioch was included in the list of Alexandrian patriarchs commemorated in the diptychs.[89] These seventh- to tenth-century diptychs prove that a patriarch from outside could be included into an otherwise local list of legitimate patriarchs and successors of the apostles. Severus, however, remained probably an exception: he was not only the major figure among the non-Chalcedonians after 518—and therefore alone worthy for remembrance—but he also lived in Egypt for almost 20 years after leaving his see in 518.[90]

[85] For the term 'confessional diptychs' see Taft, *Diptychs*, 52.

[86] That included usually their metropolitan or their patriarch, but in the Chalcedonian bishoprics of Syria II before 518 for example, the names of Peter of Apamea or Severus of Antioch were certainly not read out at the altar as the Chalcedonian bishops were not in communion with their non-Chalcedonian superiors.

[87] Evagrius, *HE* III.20, Bidez and Parmentier, 118 (Whitby, 155).

[88] *Coll. Avell.* 146.4. Hormisdas was also put in the diptychs of Scampi; *Coll. Avell.* 213.4.

[89] *Romans and Barbarians*, Boston: Museum of Fine Arts 1976, 199; M. McCormick, 'A Liturgical Diptych from Coptic Egypt in the Museum of Fine Arts', *Muséon* 94 (1981), 47–54; H. Brakmann, 'Severus unter den Alexandrinern. Zum liturgischen Diptychon in Boston', *JbAC* 26 (1983), 54–8; S. Brock, 'Tenth-Century Diptychs of the Coptic Orthodox Church in a Syriac Manuscript', *BSAC* 26 (1984), 23–9.

[90] Severus is also remembered in the Synaxarium of the Coptic Church: *Das Synaxarium. Das Koptische Heiligenbuch mit den Heiligen zu jedem Tag des Jahres,*

Non-archaeological evidence survives from the sixth century. In 550 Justinian requested the bishops of Cilicia to investigate whether Theodore of Mopsuestia—Nestorius' teacher—had ever been commemorated in Mopsuestia.[91] Theodore is not found in the diptychs, but Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, is found instead in Theodore's place.[92] Taft speaks of this as 'an anomaly', as all other bishops were local.[93] There is no reason to assume that Theodore was not inscribed into the diptychs after his death in 428. The real controversy over Nestorius and his teachings started with the Council of Ephesus in 431, and only in its aftermath the teachings of Theodore and Diodore of Tarsus were questioned. Witness to this development is a letter by Cyril to his colleague Proclus of Constantinople (434–46), in which the patriarch of Alexandria remarks on certain persons from the patriarchate of Antioch who requested the emperor to condemn Theodore and his writings.[94] As Cyril's name took the place of Theodore's name he probably substituted Theodore in the list of the dead—imposing 'an orthodox pseudo-past [. . .] on the genuine past of Mopsuestia'.[95]

Cyril claimed to have been against a condemnation of Theodore as 'his name in the East is great and his writings are admired exceedingly.

trans. R. and L. Suter, Waldsoms-Kröffelbach: St. Antonius Kloster 1994, 47. De Lacy E. O'Leary, 'Severus of Antioch in Egypt', *Aeg* 32 (1952), 425–36; L. S. B. MacCoull, '"A Dwelling Place of Christ, a Healing Place of Knowledge": The Non-Chalcedonian Eucharist in Late Antique Egypt and its Setting', in *Varieties of Devotion*, ed. S. Karaut-Nunn, Turnhout 2002, 6f.; see also: W. E. Crum, 'Sévère d'Antioche en Égypte', *ROC* 23 (1922/3), 92–104.

[91] *ACO* IV.1, 115–30. G. Dagron, 'Two Documents concerning Mid-Sixth-Century Mopsuestia', in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis*, ed. A. E. Laiou-Thomadakis, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press 1980, 19–30; Taft, *Diptychs*, 49–52. The investigators not only consulted the diptychs of the church, but also interviewed the clergy of Mopsuestia.

[92] The investigators only found another Theodore, a bishop of Mopsuestia, who had recently died.

[93] Taft, *Diptychs*, 52.

[94] Cyril, *ep.* 72, ed. in E. Schwartz, *Codex vaticanus gr. 1431. Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, ABAW.PH 32, Munich 1927, 23f. (St Cyril of Alexandria, *Letters 51–110*, trans. J. I. McEnerney, Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press 1987, 72–4).

[95] P. Gray, '"The Select Fathers": Canonizing the Patristic Past', *StPatr* 23 (1989), 35. As Severus 75 years later still advised his bishops to tolerate Theodore's name in the diptychs (see below), it seems likely that Theodore had not yet been erased, and the orthodox past was created later.

As they say, all are bearing it hard that a distinguished man, one who died in communion with the churches, now is being anathematized.'[96] Although Cyril objected to what Theodore wrote, he advised Proclus that 'prudence in these matters is the best thing and a wise one' as anything else would cause violent disturbances.[97]

Severus took Cyril's side, and interpreted his letter to mean that not only Theodore of Mopsuestia but also Diodore of Tarsus should not be removed from the diptychs because those of the East clung to the memory of them.[98] In more than one dozen letters Severus dealt with the names in the diptychs.[99] They prove that the diptychs were a major issue at this time in the East, and offer a portrait of Severus as a moderate patriarch who needed to constrain other non-Chalcedonians who favoured strictly confessional diptychs. He reminded bishop Musonius of Meloe in Isauria that 'where general unions were concerned, the fathers did not wish to inquire into the observance of the strict rule with regard to names'.[100] As long as the churches in general were orthodox, they would not be hurt or polluted by the reading of some suspicious names.[101] When the patriarch of Antioch

[96] Cyril, *ep.* 72, Schwartz, 24 (McEnerney, 73).

[97] Cyril assures his addressee that Theodore's adherents 'would choose rather to be burned in a fire' than condemn him. For an instance of reinscribing John Chrysostom back into the diptychs see F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiochia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1970, 353–5. The question whether a bishop who had died in communion with the church can be condemned occupied theologians up to the fifth ecumenical council in 553 when it was hotly debated whether the Three Chapters could be condemned or not. For the Three Chapters see the general Conclusion.

[98] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 46, Brooks, 316. Although the letter only survives in fragments, the fact that Severus quotes Cyril on this issue probably indicates that he agreed with the former patriarch of Alexandria.

[99] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 38–46, Brooks, 294–321; *Select Letters* I.3; I.11; I.19; I.22; I.30; IV.2, Brooks, 17–25 (16–23); 52–7 (47–52); 74–8 (67–70); 84–9 (75–80); 103–7 (92–6); 286–90 (253–7).

[100] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 41, Brooks, 306. Severus cites several councils including Nicaea.

[101] Severus probably had in mind bishops like Diodore of Tarsus whose orthodoxy Severus denied, but whom he did not require to be erased. Severus twice brings an example from Leviticus 11:33–6, how only the water in small vessels could be polluted, but not the water from cisterns. In the same way, a monastery could be polluted by heretical names, but not the universal Church; Severus, *Collection of Letters* 44 and 45, Brooks, 310 and 314.

wrote these letters in 516/17 he was at the height of his influence and anticipated a slow shift towards non-Chalcedonianism.[102] He did not want to jeopardize the progress the non-Chalcedonians had made over the last couple of years because more radical non-Chalcedonian bishops stirred up the population over a few names and thereby caused 'shipwreck in the most essential things'.[103] Although he had condemned Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Ibas of Edessa, and others when he became patriarch, it did not seem wise to him to enforce their condemnations with regard to the diptychs in all his patriarchate's communities.[104] Instead he left room for local peculiarities and even reproached bishops who aspired to change the diptychs completely.[105] Severus regarded the diptychs as a sensitive issue because he knew that they could not be completely altered without causing resistance among the pious lay population.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that Severus showed indifference towards the names in the diptychs. He gave out the rule that all bishops who had subscribed to the council of Chalcedon were to be erased from the diptychs:

> I mean that each should remove from the sacred tablets the names of those who signed the impious deeds of Chalcedon, but, as to the others, should remain silent and wait for a fitting season for progress to excellence. For there is no objection to ascent, as Gregory the Theologian also somewhere says.[106]

Although it is unclear whether he could enforce throughout his patriarchate the erasure of the bishops who signed Chalcedon, he was successful in such distant places as Seleucia in Isauria and

[102] That becomes obvious in two of Severus' letters: Severus, *Collection of Letters* 41 and 44, Brooks 306–8 and 310–12.

[103] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 44, Brooks, 312.

[104] 'Allocution prononcée par Sévère après son elevation sur le trône patriarchal d'Antioche', ed. M.-A. Kugener, *OrChr* 2 (1902), 265–82, here 268f. They were also condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 507; Haarer, *Anastasius I*, 140f.

[105] The bishops Solon of Seleucia and Musonius of Meloe tried to reform the whole diocese—among other things they erased all lower clergy from the diptychs and favoured re-baptism—and upset everyone in their realm including the laity; Severus, *Select Letters* I.22, Brooks, 85f. (77). J. George, 'Severus of Antioch's Response to Heresy and Religious Promiscuity', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 133–7, emphasizes Severus' pragmatic approach towards extra-doctrinal issues.

[106] Severus, *Select Letters* I.19, Brooks, 75f. (68).

Damascus in Phoenicia Libanesia.[107] As for the other questionable names, Severus had in mind not only Diodore and Theodore, but perhaps also the former patriarchs of Antioch Palladius and Peter the Fuller. Both were rejected by radical non-Chalcedonians, but Severus defended them and let their names stay in the diptychs.[108] It could be said that Severus voted for partially confessional diptychs.

Philoxenus, metropolitan of Mabbug since 485, also chose Cyril as his point of reference concerning questionable names in diptychs.[109] However, when he became metropolitan he did not hesitate to erase John (of Antioch or Cyrrhus), Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Andreas of Samosata, Ibas of Edessa, and Alexander of Mabbug from the diptychs in Mabbug.[110] In other words, Philoxenus erased several famous, but controversial bishops and theologians from outside Mabbug and even from outside the province of Euphratesia. Furthermore the list shows that no metropolitan before Philoxenus cared to purify the diptychs of Mabbug as they even included the outspoken Nestorian Alexander, who refused to accept Nestorius' condemnation and was deposed himself.[111] However, even Philoxenus did not dare to eliminate Stephen, the metropolitan of Mabbug who had represented Mabbug at the Council of Chalcedon.[112] Therefore radical non-Chalcedonians broke communion with him, but apparently Philoxenus feared the anger of his community if he erased Stephen. It may be concluded that it was an especially sensitive issue to exclude a local bishop from commemoration as the community presumably took more pride in and maintained pious devotion to him and his memory than they did with

[107] Both were metropolitan cities: Seleucia: John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 23, Nau, 56. Mammian, bishop of Damascus erased the local bishop who had signed Chalcedon: Severus, *Select Letters* I.3, Brooks, 22 (20).

[108] Severus, *Select Letters* I.3, Brooks, 22f. (21). L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VIème siècle*, Paris: E. de Boccard, Successeur 1925, 31, states that Severus eliminated the names of the former patriarchs of Antioch, John, Domnus, Maximus, Calendion, and Flavian II, from the diptychs, but does not supply the source for this information. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 86, takes this information from Duchesne.

[109] Philoxenus, 'Letters to the Orthodox Monks', in 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', ed. and trans. J. Lebon, *Muséon* 43 (1930), 206 (217).

[110] Philoxenus, 'Letters to the Orthodox Monks', in 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', Lebon, 207 (218). Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 67.

[111] Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 66f.

[112] Severus, *Select Letters* I.3, Brooks, 20 (19). Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 67.

outsiders. Local bishops remained present in the collective memory of the community and provided Christians with a sense of local identity. This did not prevent Philoxenus, as the ecclesiastical head of the diocese of Euphratesia, to erase the commemoration of the famous Theodoret from the Cyrrhian diptychs—but it explains why in 519/20 the Cyrrhians placed an image of Theodoret in a chariot and made a procession in honour of him: released from the metropolitan rule of Philoxenus they decided to commemorate the restoration of their local hero into their diptychs with a proper celebration which they certainly regarded as a return to their lawful tradition.[113]

Peter of Apamea took an even more radical approach than Philoxenus. He eliminated all Chalcedonian metropolitans of Apamea, from Domnus (Apamea's bishop at Chalcedon) up to Isaac (who died possibly *c.*513/14),[114] and substituted them with the non-Chalcedonian patriarchs of Alexandria, Dioscorus, Timothy Aelurus, and others.[115] Thereby he deprived his community of any local identity and tried to impose a strictly confessional, non-Chalcedonian identity in its place. John of Tella erased Sophronius, the bishop of Tella who represented Tella at Chalcedon, and all other Chalcedonian names from the diptychs in Tella in 519.[116]

From these four different approaches by four leading non-Chalcedonian bishops, several sets of problems concerning the diptychs can be detected: in general, Christians felt uneasy about condemning the dead who died in communion with the church. This goes beyond any Christological controversy and concerns more general Christian piety and the Christian understanding of honouring the dead. The non-Chalcedonian bishop Jacob of Sarug (519–21) reminded his flock

[113] Philoxenus, 'Letters to the Orthodox Monks', in 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', Lebon, 207 (218). For these celebrations see Chapter 1.

[114] The tenures of Apamea's metropolitans are not certain, but Severus' letters allow us to establish a relative chronology: Isaac (ordained some time before Severus until some time early in Severus' tenure), Stephen (ordained by Severus), Cosmas (ordained by Severus, resigned), and finally Peter. Severus, *Select Letters* I.11; I.30, Brooks, 52–7 (47–52); 103–7 (92–6); Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*, 54ff.

[115] *ACO* III, 104.2–105.25, and *ACO* III, 94.19–20 (apparently in the church of John which might have been the main church in Apamea).

[116] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 55 (Ghanem, 65); E. Honigmann, 'The Original Lists of the Members of the Council of Nicaea, the Robber-Synod and the Council of Chalcedon', *Byz.* 16 (1942/3), 51.

'to be careful of the memorial of your beloved ones, and of the oblation which is able to pardon your departed'.[117] It was considered profitable for the dead to be read out in church and be remembered, and the faith of the dead's relatives could quicken the dead. To turn this on its head, a condemnation of the dead might harm their afterlife. Everyone, although having died in communion with the church, might depend for his afterlife on the judgement of later generations of Christians and their understanding of orthodoxy. This must have been a disturbing thought for every faithful Christian.

Nevertheless, determined groups on both sides did not regard this as an insurmountable obstacle when it came to bishops they regarded as heretics—as the Chalcedonian clergy in Syria II proved with regard to the naming of Dioscorus and Timothy Aelurus 'whose remembrance is very difficult, [even] if to say something against the dead is grievous'.[118] But in other cities some bishops might have channelled local pride and adherence to certain heterodox bishops by including their names in the diptychs. Those regarded as followers of Nestorius nevertheless were most often condemned by non-Chalcedonian bishops, but deceased bishops who stood for less radical theological positions presented a more sensitive issue and were handled at the discretion of the local bishop in charge.

It is probably no coincidence that rather strict or even radical bishops like Philoxenus of Mabbug, Peter of Apamea, and also Solon of Seleucia and Musonius of Meloe (who tried to reform the whole system of the diptychs in their province) were the least liked by their communities. Philoxenus did not receive any support from his citizens in 518, Peter seems to have been hated by every single cleric in Syria II,[119] and the radicalism of Solon and Musonius drove their flocks to the side of the Chalcedonians.[120] On the other hand, the wavering metropolitan of Edessa, Paul, who did not sign the *libellus*, but also did not leave his city, was defended by people in Edessa

[117] Jacob of Sarug, 'A Homily of Mâr Jacob of Sérûgh on the Memorial of the Departed and on the Eucharistic Loaf', in *Homiliae Selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis*, vol. i, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris and Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1905, 535–50 (trans. H. Connolly, *DR* 29 (1910), 260–70).

[118] *ACO* III, 94.20f.

[119] See the acts of the councils of 518 and 536.

[120] Severus, *Select Letters* I.22, Brooks, 85f. (77).

against soldiers who had been sent in order to compel him to sign.[121] It is therefore likely that the majority of lay Christians who were not directly involved in the theological strife over Chalcedon hesitated to have any names erased from the diptychs and would have favoured a rather inclusive approach.

This leads to the question of the involvement of the communities in church life and particularly their say concerning the diptychs. Who decided which names were put in the diptychs, and, related to this, to what degree were the diptychs a matter of concern to the whole community? These questions are difficult to answer, as hardly any evidence has survived reflecting the opinion of the wider lay community besides monks. From Cyril's and Severus' statements it is obvious that the bishops sometimes allowed the names of certain deceased individuals to stay in the diptychs because people had affections for them, not because these persons were regarded as worthy of being named at the altar by the bishops of the city. Although the bishop of a city controlled the diptychs of his church in the end, the initiative of who was to be in the diptychs might have come from the community—or even from an outsider. But in the case of an outsider it probably had to be a cleric, as Severus shows: the patriarch asked an unknown bishop of an unknown church to include a deacon of the church of Alexandria in the diptychs.[122] In probably exceptional cases even the arch-heresiarch Nestorius could appear in the diptychs, as was the case with the diptychs of the metropolis of Cilicia I, Tarsus. Dionysius, the metropolitan of Tarsus, proved to Severus that he was a non-Chalcedonian and may even have been one of the bishops who ordained Severus, but on the other hand he ordained Chalcedonian priests in his city, and apparently allowed Nestorius to be included in the diptychs of his church.[123] The assembly that was held in Cyrrhus in honour of Nestorius, who was presented as a martyr of the province of Euphratesia, also demonstrates that some easterners still held Nestorius in high esteem.[124] It was impossible—illegal in fact—to venerate Nestorius openly, but

[121] See Chapter 1.

[122] Severus, *Select Letters* I.54, Brooks, 181 (163).

[123] Severus, *Select Letters* IV.4 and I.24, Brooks, 293f. (260f.) and 94 (84), and 'Allocution prononcée par Sévère', Kugener, 273.

[124] See Chapter 1.

this did not belittle his reputation among some sections of easterners in the sixth century.

In conclusion, the matter of the diptychs presents a rather diverse picture of the state of the church in the East before 518. Some bishops like Dionysius of Tarsus, but also Timothy of Constantinople, took a rather ecumenical approach by not exposing themselves too much to either side of the controversy.[125] Dionysius might have given in to popular demand and let Nestorius be included in the diptychs of his church, but at the same time he tried to please his superior Severus by offering a non-Chalcedonian statement of faith to him.[126]

Most bishops in the time of Severus, who were involved in the Christological controversy, tended to install (partially) confessional diptychs in their cities, purged of at least the most debatable names. When Macedonius of Constantinople had been condemned in 512, people were assured about his condemnation in mass 'when the deacon made the proclamation and did not mention his [Macedonius'] name, and it was not read in the Diptych'.[127] As the Chalcedonian bishops of Syria II broke from communion with their metropolitan Peter of Apamea, they certainly reflected this in their diptychs by erasing Peter's name. After having left their sees, Severus and Peter were probably immediately erased, and it can hardly be doubted that Philoxenus and John of Tella were also erased from the diptychs in their cities. As soon as the Chalcedonians took over the patriarchate of Alexandria in 537 they cleaned the Alexandrian diptychs as well.[128]

As the diptychs present an important part of the liturgy placed right before the Eucharist, any amendments or erasure of names targeted the heart of every local church. It was the place where the church through the names of the dead defined its Christian tradition down to the apostolic past. In the same way it declared publicly communion with other local churches (that were beyond the reach of

[125] For Timothy see Chapter 1.

[126] It may be, however, that Dionysius switched sides. Dionysius or his successor stayed in office when the *libellus* was enforced in the East.

[127] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VII.8, Brooks, 47 (Brooks, 32; Hamilton and Brooks, 175).

[128] Severus remarked that Dioscorus was now (in 537) regarded among the heretics in Alexandria; Severus, *Select Letters* IV.9, Brooks, 304 (270).

the Eucharist community) through the names of the living. Therefore the diptychs contained in a microcosm the claim of every local church to be part of a long Christian tradition and to be part of the universal Church.[129]

In order to see how this microcosm fits the broader framework of ecclesiastical and imperial policy, it is necessary to return to 519 and Justin's attempt to enforce the *libellus* among non-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians alike.

JUSTIN AND THE CHALCEDONIANS IN THE EAST

Justin accomplished a task which rendered him a truly Roman emperor: a reunion of the old and the new Rome. He underlined this union and his role in this undertaking by condemning his predecessors Zeno and Anastasius; both were erased from the diptychs in Constantinople, a radical disassociation from the imperial past which not even the pope had demanded.[130] However, that did not make him a 'new Marcian' as Hormisdas and part of the populace in Constantinople had hoped.[131] Justin needed stability. He may have hoped that the *libellus* would be accepted by most bishops because it did not condemn any living bishop as heretic. The emperor may have expected that eastern Chalcedonians were so desperate to crush the overpowering influence of Severus that they would accept the *libellus*, even if that included the erasure of some Chalcedonian names in the diptychs. However, as furious resistance against the *libellus* came from both parties in the East, non-Chalcedonians as

[129] See K. Bowes, 'Ivory Lists: Consular Diptychs, Christian Appropriation and Polemics of Time in Late Antiquity', *Art History* 24.3 (2001), 338–57, especially 347–53.

[130] *Coll. Avell.* 167; J. Richards, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages 476–752*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1979, 104. K. Rosen stresses that Justin must have given the order: 'Iustinus I (Kaiser)', *RAC* 19 (2001), 769. Evans, *The Empress Theodora*, 68, is wrong to assume that the erasure of Zeno and Anastasius from the diptychs was the pope's will. Similarly McGuckin, 'The "Theopaschite Confession"', 243.

[131] *Coll. Avell.* 116 and 126: Hormisdas wished a union between him and Justin, as Leo and Marcian had brought for the church. Richards, *Popes and Papacy*, 105, states that Justin saw himself as Marcian. For the population praising Justin as Marcian see Chapter 1.

well as Chalcedonians, Justin and Justinian addressed the issue of the names in the diptychs in several letters to the pope in 520, and urged Hormisdas to soften his policy:[132]

> But there have been several cities and churches, both Pontic and Asian and especially eastern, whose clergy and laity, though thoroughly assailed by all threats and persuasions, nevertheless to no avail have been influenced that they should abrogate and should remove the names of bishops whose repute has flourished among them, but they count life harsher than death, if they shall have condemned the dead, in whose life, when alive, they used to glory.[133]

Perhaps the main problem was not Acacius himself, but some of his successors like Euphemius and Macedonius.[134] Not only the churches of the patriarchate of Constantinople held these two former Constantinopolitan patriarchs in high esteem, but also churches in the patriarchate of Antioch. The council that was held in Tyre, the metropolitan city of the province Phoenicia Maritima, in 518, venerated them as 'holy fathers' for their defence of Chalcedon. The crowd demanded Euphemius and Macedonius to be inscribed into their diptychs.[135]

As the pope did not grant a general waiver concerning the erasure of the Chalcedonian bishops, it seems that a rather pragmatic solution was found in order to pacify the feelings of eastern Chalcedonians. Although it is dangerous to make any conclusions *ex silentio*, the fading away of resistance on the side of the Chalcedonians in the East after 520 cannot be put aside. Since the correspondence between Rome and Constantinople has not survived beyond the year 521 it is difficult to trace this solution. However, the urgent letters that Constantinople sent to the pope about this matter stopped in 520, and other sources—like the chronicles—report only non-Chalcedonian resistance. It may therefore be concluded that a solution was found

[132] *Coll. Avell.* 192 (9 July 520); 196 (like 192); 200 (31 August 520); 232 (9 September 520); 235 (like 232).

[133] *Coll. Avell.* 232, quoted from *Roman State and Christian Church*, vol. iii, trans. P. R. Coleman-Norton, London: SPCK 1966, 984. Justinian pressed the pope more on this issue—by writing more letters and using a rather dramatic language: neither exile nor sword could persuade certain cities to condemn and remove from the diptychs the followers of Acacius; *Coll. Avell.* 196.

[134] As the claim by the non-Chalcedonians in 532/3 shows, Acacius must have been in some diptychs in the East.

[135] *ACO* III, 84.

in 521. And indeed this year saw two important changes concerning ecclesiastical policy.

First, two letters of the pope from 26 March 521, to Justin and the Constantinopolitan patriarch Epiphanius (520–35) granted the patriarch of Constantinople the right to act on behalf of the pope.[136] Epiphanius could accept persons who repented back into communion, and collect the *libelli* for the pope and send them to Rome. Thereby the papacy gave up immediate jurisdiction and delegated it to the patriarch.[137] Hormisdas still demanded the form of the *libellus* to be honoured, but already patriarch John II (518–20) in his *libellus* from 519 to the pope had taken the liberty to leave out the part of the *libellus* concerning Acacius which reads 'who was condemned by the Apostolic See'.[138] It seems therefore likely that the patriarch in general made some decisions of his own without awaiting papal approval, and judged about the orthodoxy of certain churches or individuals at his discretion.[139]

Second, a few months later, Paul the Jew resigned as patriarch of Antioch and was replaced by Euphrasius from Jerusalem (521–6).[140] Paul as radical opponent of Severus and extreme Chalcedonian had probably enforced a strict policy concerning the diptychs and erased all suspicious names including the names of several Chalcedonian patriarchs.[141] His successor Euphrasius, however, being from Jerusalem (although perhaps not a neo-Chalcedonian) may have been more inclined to accept the wishes and feelings of his fellow eastern Chalcedonians than Paul—and Euphrasius was certainly elected because of this. It seems therefore likely that Euphrasius interpreted the

[136] *Coll. Avell.* 236 and 237; Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 179f.

[137] The papacy claimed jurisdiction over any church since Gelasius (492–6); see Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium*, 116–18.

[138] See above n. 49.

[139] As mentioned above, Acacius was again highly honoured in the middle Byzantine period: this veneration must have survived (if not in Constantinople itself) somewhere in the patriarchate of Constantinople.

[140] Evagrius, *HE* IV.4, Bidez and Parmentier, 154 (Whitby, 203). Euphrasius followed Paul the Jew in his hard line against non-Chalcedonians; see *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 51 (Harrak, 73).

[141] Which would mean that Flavian II, patriarch of Antioch, who lost his see to Severus, and was venerated by the Council of Tyre in 518 (and whom Chalcedonians required that he be put in the diptychs), would have been erased again; see Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, 149–58.

passage in the *libellus* about the followers of Acacius less strictly than Paul. This again would leave room to handle names of certain heterodox bishops in the diptychs in the same manner as Severus had decided about these sensitive cases before him. Thereby Justin could apparently pacify eastern Chalcedonians, although further evidence is lacking.[142]

THE NON-CHALCEDONIANS AND THEIR PAST

The non-Chalcedonians in the East were a different matter. No less than Hormisdas did the non-Chalcedonians claim the orthodox past for their side, but their understanding about this past and the foundation of the Church differed from the pope's. The claim of the papacy to primacy based on Peter being the rock of the Church and founder of the church of Rome, was not authoritative in the East.[143] Although, for example, Justinian explicitly acknowledged the pope's succession of the apostle Peter, the extent of the papal 'primacy must have frequently bewildered the Easterners'.[144] This is especially true for the non-Chalcedonians as some eastern Chalcedonians might have preferred to support any papal claim if this only helped to limit the authority of a non-Chalcedonian patriarch like Severus of Antioch.[145]

De Vries points out that Peter had an outstanding reputation among the Syrian non-Chalcedonians. However, Peter did not bear

[142] McGuckin, 'The "Theopaschite Confession"', 243, claims that '[b]y 521 no one in the East bothered about the anathemas on any except Acacius himself', but fails to lay out how he reached this conclusion.

[143] Matthew 16:18; see *libellus* above. Pope Felix requested Acacius to choose between 'the communion of Peter the Apostle [i.e., the papacy] and that of Peter [i.e., Mongus] the Alexandrian'; *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. vii, ed. J. D. Mansi, Florence: Expenses Antonii Zatta 1763 [reprint Berlin and Paris 1902], 1066 (quoted from C. Haas, 'Patriarch and People: Peter Mongus of Alexandria and Episcopal Leadership in the Late Fifth Century', *JECS* 1 (1993), 309f.). Later in the sixth century it was John Philoponus who strongly opposed any claims of papal primacy; for him see general Conclusion.

[144] *Coll. Avell.* 235. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium*, 119, referring to Gelasius.

[145] Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium*, 127f.

the same significance of identification in the apostolic past for the non-Chalcedonians as he did for the papacy.[146] Zachariah Rhetor employed Matthew 16:18 and the image of the rock when he praised Peter the Fuller as a second Simon Cephas (Rock).[147] Philoxenus of Mabbug placed the faith of his Chalcedonian successor as metropolitan in opposition to his own faith 'which is that of Peter and the Apostles'.[148] Philoxenus did not have in mind Peter as the founder of the church of Rome, but in his eastern understanding the true incorrupt faith of the apostle Peter formed the rock of the Church.[149] Severus used Matthew 16:18 in a homily to demonstrate the (chronological) primacy of Antioch, which was regarded as the see of Peter as well.[150] The patriarch emphasized Peter's role as the founder of the church of Antioch and called the Antiochene church the 'apostolic church' and 'mother of the eastern churches'.[151]

In fact, at the same time when Justin enforced the papal *libellus* in the East, John of Tella offered an alternative perception of the foundation of the Christian Church. John of Tella explained this to the monks around his city in a letter which he probably wrote at the time when he became bishop in 519, that it is:

the spiritual foundation that the offences of the heretics cannot shake, that the divine Paul, the wise master-builder, has set for us, so that everyone may build on it wisely a heavenly building according to the measure of the gift that he received from God;[152] and he shows us as if by a finger that no one can set up another foundation besides it; and he who dares to set up another

[146] W. de Vries, 'Primat, Communio und Kirche bei den frühen syrischen Monophysiten', *OCP* 18 (1952), especially 58–61. *Idem, Der Kirchenbegriff der von den Rom getrennten Syrer*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1955, 7–38. The Syrians knew, however, the special honour which the see of Rome held among Christians; de Vries, *Der Kirchenbegriff*, 15.

[147] Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* V.9, *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, vol. i, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 83, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1921, 233 (trans. *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, vol. i, ed. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 87, Paris: Etypographeo Reipublicae 1924, 161; Hamilton and Brooks, 126).

[148] Philoxenus, *Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbug (485–519)*, trans. Arthur A. Vaschalde, Rome: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei 1902, 14. Philoxenus wrote this when he was already in exile.

[149] For the eastern Chalcedonian understanding of Peter see Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium*, 133–5.

[150] Severus, *Homilies* 61, Brière, in *PO* 8, 261f.

[151] Severus, *Homilies* 56, Duval, in *PO* 4, 77 and 80.

[152] 1 Corinthians 3:10.

foundation except if it is established by Paul, this [man's] labor is useless. He fights the air in his folly which is remote from knowledge.[153]

The foundation of the Church is Christ on whom 'was built heaven and earth', but after him it was Paul, 'the divine master-builder' who established the church.[154] On the establishment of Paul 'the holy martyrs built their victories [...], holy men built holiness, the celibates chastity [...], others the rising on pillars' and finally others 'were able to suffer by those who wrongfully [...] persecuted them'.[155]

It was also Paul who guided the church fathers through the pre-Chalcedonian past:

And [the council of Nicaea] considered and saw wisely where it set up its building; and the divine Paul, wise among spiritual master-builders, invoked them, and showed them the true foundation, a rock that cannot be shaken; on it they will place and build their building; and those he spoke before them when he was saying: Another foundation except for this you should not constitute, this is Jesus Christ;[156] it was on this that Simeon built and John; on it Thomas completed [his mission] in Cush. And in Egypt Mark built upon it, and Addai the house of the Medians, Persians and Parthians. And it was on this that the apostle Matthew built in Palestine, and Jacob, the brother of our Lord.[157]

[153] John of Tella, *Statement of Faith (Libellus Fidei)*, BL Add. 14549, fol. 219b; see *John of Tella's* Statement of Faith, ed. and trans. K. Akalin and V. Menze, TeCLA, Piscataway: Gorgias Press (forthcoming). The letter does not mention Julian of Halicarnassus, who would have been included among the heretics if the letter was written some time after 520 when the quarrels between Severus and Julian started; see R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa Controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'Incorruptibilité du Corps du Christ*, Leuven: P. Smeesters 1924, 24f. John probably wrote it at the beginning of his episcopal tenure as a circular letter to the monks around Tella in which he assured them about his faith; see also A. Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde*, vol. i, CSCO 307, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1970, 163 and *idem, History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, vol. iii, CSCO 500, Leuven: Peeters 1988, 176 and 198. The letter leaves no doubt of John's profound theological training, and it is surprising that this fascinating text has not yet been analysed. H. Kleyn in his edition and translation of *Het Leven van Johannes van Tella door Elias*, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882, xi, did not grant it any theological weight of its own; W. A. Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites*, London: Faith Press 1923, 103, gives a few introductory notes.

[154] Peter is mentioned by name only once in the text.

[155] John of Tella, *Statement of Faith*, BL Add. 14549, fol. 220a. The persecutions could refer to earlier persecutions as well as to the situation of the non-Chalcedonians in 519.

[156] 1 Corinthians 3:11.

[157] John of Tella, *Statement of Faith*, BL Add. 14549, fol. 221b.

According to John of Tella this Pauline foundation was abandoned at Chalcedon as 'the council of Chalcedon builds not at all on the foundation that the divine master-builder Paul has set up, but on the sand that Nestorius, the confused and dethroned builder, put to it'.[158] John of Tella reminded his audience that Scripture had only proclaimed one Son and asked them therefore to be steadfast in the eve of new challenges. He explained that there could not have been a Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon:

> There is no quaternity in heaven, there is the Trinity. And there is no quaternity in the Church of the Apostles, for she takes pride in the Trinity. There is no confusion to it, and neither place nor space for the council of Chalcedon in the Church of God. [...] If there was a quaternity [in heaven], a quaternity [of councils] would be accepted, wherever, now, the Trinity is proclaimed, it is only three [councils] that are accepted. There is no quaternity in the Trinity because the apostolic Church has proclaimed the Trinity.[159]

Here John links a mystic apostolic past to the patristic age, and connects the faith of the apostolic church with that of his own party, thereby drawing a conclusion about the correct Christology. A post-Chalcedonian past as perceived by the papacy and the Chalcedonians was not possible because it would betray the apostolic church.[160]

It was this non-Chalcedonian claim to the apostolic Church and its patristic past that Hormisdas' *libellus* attempted to erase. The *libellus* condemned the post-Chalcedonian past of the non-Chalcedonians and the succession of their bishops. The diptychs which linked the apostolic past with the post-Chalcedonian era by commemorating the names of the dead and living would have presented the visible sign of papal condemnation if purged of non-Chalcedonian bishops. Hormisdas' insistence to break the (non-Chalcedonian) episcopal continuity is a radical innovation that set the *libellus* apart from earlier imperial edicts like the Encyclical and the Counter-Encyclical, which had also required all eastern bishops to sign a statement of faith.

In 475 Basiliscus, the usurper against the emperor Zeno, had changed the religious policy of the empire by issuing the Encyclical

[158] *Idem*, fol. 221b.

[159] *Idem*, fols. 221a–221b; already noted by Wigram, *Separation of the Monophysites*, 103.

[160] In the same letter John included a heresiology which of course included besides Nestorius and Eutyches also the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo.

which condemned 'all the innovations that occurred at Chalcedon contrary to the sacred creed'.[161] Clearly, Basiliscus had hoped to win the support of the non-Chalcedonians in the empire, but as he met strong resistance by the patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius, he recalled the Encyclical. Less than a year later he issued the Counter-Encyclical which renounced the Encyclical, but did not mention the Council of Chalcedon at all.[162] Hundreds of bishops were required to sign the Encyclical, and they did, but the same bishops also signed the Counter-Encyclical only months later.[163] After having signed the Counter-Encyclical they claimed in a petition to Acacius that 'we have subscribed [to the Encyclical] not in accordance with our intention but under constraint, agreeing with these matters in written word and speech but not with heart'.[164] The non-Chalcedonian John Rufus records the alleged words of the bishop of Attalea in Pamphylia, Claudius, who defended—in his case—the signature under the Counter-Encyclical that 'I signed with [my] hand, but not at all with [my] soul and [my] heart.'[165] The reactions to both encyclicals demonstrate how much most bishops felt compelled to obey imperial will. Although the bishops' faith was compromised, they preferred to stay in office rather than to oppose imperial order.

Justin may have hoped in 518 that the non-Chalcedonian bishops would—like the bishops of 475/6—remain loyal to the emperor in

[161] Evagrius, *HE* III.4–9, Bidez and Parmentier, 102f. (Whitby, 135). For the texts of the (Counter-)Encyclical see: P. Allen, 'Ps.-Zachariah Scholasticus and the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus', *JThS* n.s. 31.2 (1980), 477–9. There were of course more individual *libelli*: if a bishop was suspected of heresy his superior could require from him a statement of faith as examples in the letters of Severus show (see Severus, *Select Letters* IV.4 and V.7, Brooks, 293f. (260f.) and 360f. (319)). Furthermore when Severus was ordained, the bishops also signed the condemnation of heretics and claimed to be of one communion. For two papal *libelli* before Hormisdas' *libellus* see Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 134f.

[162] Evagrius, *HE* III.4–9, Bidez and Parmentier, 100–9 (Whitby, 133–44). See also the *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 68–85; *Les Saints Stylites*, ed. H. Delehaye, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes 1923, 65–80 (*Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. Theodore of Sykeon and St. John the Almsgiver*, trans. E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1996, 48–59).

[163] According to Evagrius, *HE* III.5, Bidez and Parmentier, 104 (Whitby, 138), 500 bishops; Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* V.2 even speaks of 700, Brooks, 213 (Brooks, 147; Hamilton and Brooks, 107).

[164] Evagrius, *HE* III.9, Bidez and Parmentier, 108 (Whitby, 144).

[165] John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 82, Nau, 138. See also *Plerophoriae* 59, 82, 84, and 86.

order to maintain their sees and avoid exile. However, the Encyclical and Counter-Encyclical were written up in the East by an emperor who wished to be as inclusive as possible and to demand as little as possible. The Encyclical and the Counter-Encyclical did not cause any actual changes in the diptychs which would force the bishops to redefine their past.[166]

By contrast, the *libellus* targeted the sensitive issue of the diptychs and imposed a papal perception of the Christian Church onto the East. It made it impossible for non-Chalcedonians to enter a discussion with Chalcedonians on equal terms. Thus if Dioscorus and all eastern bishops who were of the same persuasion and saw themselves in the same tradition were regarded as heretics, there was no common ground to discuss Chalcedon. The orthodoxy of Dioscorus was necessary to justify the orthodoxy of the non-Chalcedonians in 532/3 as Dioscorus was the principal non-Chalcedonian who refused to sign Chalcedon. Timothy Aelurus, Peter the Fuller, and others linked the non-Chalcedonians of 518 and 532/3 with the generation of Dioscorus, and Dioscorus linked them with Cyril and an undisputed and undefiled pre-Chalcedonian and apostolic past.[167]

THE DEBATE IN CONSTANTINOPLE IN 532/3: PART II

The debate in 532/3 was only possible under the condition that both sides left aside their condemnations and accepted the other as a

[166] Severus, *Collection of Letters* 42 and 44, Brooks, 308f. and 311f., refers to Timothy Aelurus having signed the Encyclical, but this did not require having any names changed in the diptychs.

[167] John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 66, depicted Dioscorus as the only faithful bishop while the others betrayed their faith: V. Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma. Johannes Rufus, das Konzil von Chalkedon und die wahre Kirche', in J. Hahn/Ch. Ronning, *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2003, 228. According to another story Dioscorus (*Plerophoriae* 69) was replaced by the Antichrist, who came into the world through Chalcedon: J.-E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Gorgias Press: Piscataway, NJ 2002, 137. John Rufus is not consistent when the Antichrist would appear in this world, but Chalcedon was the key; see also. S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'Remembering Pain: Syriac Historiography and the Separation of the Churches', *Byz.* 58 (1988), 301.

legitimate heir of the Cyrillian legacy.[168] For the Chalcedonians that may have been more difficult than for the non-Chalcedonians as it meant that unofficially the *libellus* was temporarily suspended. Here lies one reason why the Chalcedonians refused repeatedly to make any official records of the meetings, as these records would have proved this concession.[169]

Justinian treated the non-Chalcedonians in the debates as schismatics, but not as heretics.[170] He could do so because ecclesiastically the church was in a state of confusion which was created in 518/19 by trying to reconcile eastern and western Chalcedonians without calling an ecumenical council: Pope Hormisdas had anathematized Dioscorus, Timothy Aelurus, Peter Mongus, Acacius 'with his followers (*sequacibus*)', Peter the Fuller, Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, Cyrus of Edessa (470–98), and Peter of Apamea in a letter (10 February 518) to priests, deacons, and archimandrites of Syria II.[171] However, how binding were these condemnations for the universal Church? A papal letter certainly carried some weight, and this specific one survives not only in Latin through the papal archives, but also in a Greek version that was later included in the proceedings of the council of 536 in Constantinople.[172] However, when Hormisdas had sent this letter he apparently could only please the notorious anti-Peter and anti-Severus faction of Chalcedonians in Syria II.[173] As discussed above, Hormisdas did not gain general support in the East, and he does not seem to have had much success in stirring up opposition against Anastasius and his non-Chalcedonian

[168] Leo and his *Tome* were apparently not discussed at all in 532/3.

[169] See also Av. Cameron, 'Disputations, Polemical Literature and the Formation of Opinion in the Early Byzantine Period', in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East*, ed. G. J. Reinink and H. L. J. Vanstiphout, OLA 42, Leuven: Peeters 1991, 103.

[170] The term 'schismatic' is used here in the sense of 'being separated' from the church, but not because of doctrinal reasons. The term 'schismatic' itself does not appear any more in Justinian's legislation; see Noethlich, 'Iustinianus (Kaiser)', 744. A good discussion of the development of the terms 'heresy' and 'schism' in antiquity can be found in F. Winkelmann, 'Einige Aspekte der Entwicklung der Begriffe Häresie und Schisma in der Spätantike', *Koinaonia* 6 (1982), 89–109.

[171] *Coll. Avell.* 140.15.

[172] *Coll. Avell.* 140; *ACO* IV.2.

[173] Although Chalcedonians in the East would have agreed to most of the condemnations with the exception of Acacius and his followers.

policy. However, even if most eastern Chalcedonians would have supported the papal point of view, such far-reaching condemnations could only be decided by a patriarchal council according to eastern ecclesiastical understanding—not by the pope alone. Already John II crossed out Hormisdas' phrase in the *libellus* that Acacius had been condemned by the papacy. Hormisdas' letter to priests, deacons, and archimandrites of Syria II gained importance in 536, but certainly could not force Justinian to regard the non-Chalcedonians as heretics in 532/3.

The same is true for the decisions of the Council of Syria II in 518 which had also anathematized Severus and the metropolitan Peter of Apamea. It seems highly questionable whether suffragan bishops could canonically condemn their superiors.[174]

By contrast, the decisions by the council held in Constantinople in July 518 were sent to eastern cities and legally binding. The council condemned Severus and followed thereby an established pattern of former councils in condemning the representative of what the majority saw as heresy.[175] The logical consequence of his condemnation was the restitution of the former Chalcedonian patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius into the diptychs. In one respect only the council remained legally problematic: its decision to depose or condemn a bishop needed to be handed out to this bishop, but this seems to have happened with neither Severus nor any other non-Chalcedonian bishop in 518.[176]

[174] See Chapter 1. At the end of the *libellus* of the monks of Syria II in which they condemned Peter of Apamea, there is a note from the papal legates that they also condemned Severus, Peter, and their fellows. However, this note was written in 536. According to Canon 9 of the Council of Chalcedon, bishops who have a dispute with their metropolitan should go to the 'exarch of the diocese or to the see of imperial Constantinople' (*The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. iii, trans. with introduction and notes by R. Price and M. Gaddis, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005, 97). J. Speigl, 'Synoden im Gefolge der Wende der Religionspolitik unter Kaiser Justinos (518)', *OstKSt* 45 (1996), 18f., apparently regards the condemnation of Severus and Peter by the bishops of Syria II as canonical.

[175] See Chapter 1. The East Syrian *Chronicle of Seert* (*PO* 7, 139) mentions that Severus, his followers, and all who spoke of one nature in Christ were condemned by this council, but the actual Greek text of the council only speaks of Severus: *ACO* III.25, 64.

[176] Before 518, a messenger of the bishops in Syria II, disguised as a woman, had given a sentence of deposition to Severus; Evagrius, *HE* III.34, Bidez and Parmentier, 133f. (Whitby, 178f.). See also the difficulties the papal legates had to give a document of condemnation to Acacius: Evagrius, *HE* III.21, Bidez and Parmentier, 119 (Whitby, 156).

Nevertheless, it is unlikely that this would have posed a serious problem. The legal confusion took shape through the incompatibility of the council's decisions and the *libellus*' demands. The *libellus* forced eastern Chalcedonians to condemned their heroes Euphemius and Macedonius. It regarded the non-Chalcedonians in general as a subgroup of the heresy of Eutyches, but lacked the explicit condemnation of Severus.[177] A general council could have rectified these discords, and explicitly condemned the 'Severians', that is, the followers of the persuasion of Severus, as heretics. Justin would have been compelled to issue laws against these new heretics, which would have included the burning of their writings as had happened in 435 against Nestorius and his followers and in 452 against the Eutychians.[178] But this did not happen until 536 when the Council in Constantinople condemned Severus and Justinian issued the appropriate laws.[179]

The *libellus* became the cornerstone of orthodoxy, but as discussed above, in sensitive cases like the condemnations of Chalcedonian patriarchs, eastern Chalcedonians preferred rather to follow the decisions of the Council of Constantinople in 518 than to accept the papal demands to clear their diptychs of suspicious names. Therefore Justinian probably understood very well that the non-Chalcedonians also clung to the names of some of their deceased bishops.

In 532/3 it worked to Justinian's advantage to regard the *libellus* as the cornerstone of orthodoxy which overruled the decisions of the Council of Constantinople in 518. As the *libellus* had avoided explicitly calling Severus and his fellow bishops heretics, it allowed Justinian to regard them as schismatic bishops who had turned away from the Church.[180] This perception arose not out of goodwill, but it

[177] For laws against heretics and the idea of subgroups see C. Humfress, 'Roman Law, Forensic Argument and the Formation of Christian Orthodoxy (III–VI Centuries)', in *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire. Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, ed. S. Elm and É. Rebillard, École Française: Rome 2000, 125–47.

[178] Humfress, 'Roman Law, Forensic Argument and the Formation of Christian Orthodoxy', 127. *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. v, ed. J. D. Mansi, Florence: Expenses Antonii Zatta 1763 [reprint Berlin and Paris 1902], 413 (*Roman State and Christian Church*, vol. ii, 700–2) and *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, vol. 7, Mansi, 501–6 (*Roman State and Christian Church*, vol. ii, 820–6).

[179] See Chapter 5.

[180] Although obviously the heresiology established by the *libellus* implicitly condemned Severus as Eutychian.

could enormously facilitate Justinian's endeavour to come to terms with the Syrian non-Chalcedonians.[181] When Pope Felix III and his council of seventy-seven bishops condemned Acacius in 484, the pope ruled that Acacius could never be dissolved from this anathema.[182] But in contrast to condemned heretics, with schismatics, the emperor only needed to find terms that would make it acceptable for them to return into communion.

This lenient perception of non-Chalcedonians as schismatics according to the Syriac account is corroborated by Innocentius' report who let the emperor speak about the non-Chalcedonian bishops as those 'who have withdrawn with Severus from the Church'. In other words, not even the Chalcedonians called the non-Chalcedonians heretics at any point of the debate.[183]

Justinian only spoke about names added to the diptychs, not about those that were erased. Innocentius in his report confirmed that the matter of the diptychs was an issue in the debate. Innocentius focused on the extra (Chalcedonian) names in the diptychs as well—the names of those who had been present at ecumenical councils (like Chalcedon) and had signed them.[184] Like Justinian, he did not mention any discussion of the erasure of deceased bishops from the diptychs, a much more delicate topic for the Chalcedonians who certainly wished to avoid a discussion about Chalcedonian bishops whom the *libellus* required to be erased.

Justinian's rather pragmatic attempt to find an agreement with the non-Chalcedonians at the very end of the debate demonstrates that not only the additions, but also the erasures of bishops suspected of heresy were at stake. He proposed that if the non-Chalcedonians accepted the

[181] Scholars usually believe that the non-Chalcedonians are part of the heretics condemned in *Cod. Iust.* I 5.12.4, but why should they not be named like many other—and considerably smaller—'heretical' groups? After 536 they were named in imperial laws (cf. *Nov.* 109 from 541); see R. Haacke, 'Die kaiserliche Politik in den Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (451–553)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 149.

[182] Caspar, *Papsttum*, vol. ii, 32.

[183] Innocentius 4; *ACO* IV.2, 169. At the end of his letter Innocentius has to admit that, with the exception of Philoxenus of Doliche, the other non-Chalcedonian 'bishops have remained in their opposition (*dissuasio*)' (Innocentius 89; *ACO* IV.2, 184).

[184] Innocentius 64–70; *ACO* IV.2, 180. He broadened the subject in order to put Chalcedon in line with the previous ecumenical councils, but what was really at stake were those bishops who had subscribed to Chalcedon.

libellus and the Council of Chalcedon 'as far as the expulsion of Eutyches was concerned', without the definition of faith, then they might be allowed to 'anathematize Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, [and] Ibas'.[185] This suggestion picks up previous requests by eastern Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians to anathematize the theological foundation of any extreme dyophysite Christology. Nevertheless Justinian hardly elaborated here on a compelling theological argument, but first of all presented an elegant political solution. The emperor offers a compromise: he could not question the *libellus* with its request to cross out some names from the diptychs in non-Chalcedonian churches, but he allowed them to cross out some suspicious Chalcedonians as well if that settled the quarrel over Chalcedon.

To accept the council of Chalcedon 'as far as the expulsion of Eutyches was concerned', without the definition of faith, certainly presented a major obstacle for the non-Chalcedonians. However, this requirement alone might not have been insurmountable as the Syrian non-Chalcedonians adopted the canons of this council as disciplinary canons. They are usually included among the canons of general and local councils and can be found in Syrian Orthodox manuscripts that collected such legal texts for future generations of clergy.[186] In Vööbus' West Syrian Synodicon they are placed between the decree of the (First) Council of Ephesus (431) and the questions to the (non-Chalcedonian) patriarch Timothy Aelurus (457–60, 475–7).[187] But also other, unpublished Syrian Orthodox manuscripts contain the canons of this council.[188] Therefore this part of Justinian's

[185] S7; Brock, 'The Conversations', 116.

[186] For an overview of the Syrian Orthodox manuscript tradition of general councils (including Chalcedon) see W. Selb, *Orientalisches Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii: *Die Geschichte des Kirchenrechts der Westsyrer (von den Anfängen bis zur Mongolenzeit)*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1989, 140–2.

[187] *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, ed. and trans. A. Vööbus, CSCO 376/8, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1975, 129–39 (130–8).

[188] See for example the Syriac manuscripts in London: BL Add. 14528, fols. 1–151 (sixth century, maybe 501) even lists the subscribing bishops and the resolution of the Council of Chalcedon concerning the Confession of Faith, but this might not have originally been a 'non-Chalcedonian' manuscript; W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. ii, London: British Museum 1871, 1031f.; certainly a non-Chalcedonian manuscript is BL Add. 14526, fols. 1–39 (seventh century, probably soon after 641) which lists the canons of the Council of Chalcedon (and also the creeds of the Councils of Chalcedon, Nicaea, and Constantinople with a brief account of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon,

requirements, the acceptance of Chalcedon in a modified form without its doctrinal formula, might have been reasonable even for the non-Chalcedonians, and the emperor seems to have found it useful to follow this line of argument in the years to come.[189]

A crucial problem, however, was posed by the *libellus*, and the non-Chalcedonians declined Justinian's offer because the *libellus* would have ruled out the orthodoxy of their post-Chalcedonian past.[190] As seen above, this post-Chalcedonian past had actually been disputed among non-Chalcedonians—patriarchs like Peter Mongus or Peter the Fuller were criticized for making compromises towards the Chalcedonians. While in office Severus expressed his anger with the Alexandrians for having included Peter Mongus in their diptychs.[191] After the religious landscape changed in 518, it seems that also the memory of this past changed—or that a redefinition was necessary.

From the perspective of 532/3, these patriarchs were ecclesiastical fathers who had guaranteed an unbroken succession of Cyrillian bishops and non-Chalcedonian tradition in the East after Chalcedon. Therefore the non-Chalcedonian bishops probably emphasized now in 532/3 that they could not condemn Peter Mongus, Peter the Fuller, and—surprisingly—Acacius. This demonstrates the desire of the non-Chalcedonian bishops to represent the true Cyrillian legacy in the debate with the Chalcedonians. Of course, already before 518 the non-Chalcedonians had argued that Chalcedon had abandoned the true faith.[192] However, now that officially Leo and his *Tome* took over the diptychs and churches in the East, the non-Chalcedonians strengthened their position by integrating Acacius on their side. The Chalcedonians were on the defensive, to explain why Acacius

giving the date of each and the reason for its being assembled) after the Canons of John, bishop of Tella; Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 1035f.; see also BL Add. 12155 (eighth century); Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 948f.

189 See Chapter 5 and Conclusion.

190 See already Brock, 'The Conversations', 117 n. 93. Whether Justinian gave the *libellus* the same weight as modern historians remains unknown. He could not withdraw from it, anyway, and his later attempts to reconcile the non-Chalcedonians to Chalcedon pick up the non-Chalcedonian requests for a condemnation of the writings of Theodoret and Ibas; see general Conclusion.

191 Severus, *Select Letters* IV.2, Brooks, 287 (254).

192 See note 167 above on John Rufus and the Antichrist.

was replaced by Leo—especially delicate as parts of the Chalcedonians in the East also regarded the papacy as Nestorian.[193]

That the non-Chalcedonians stood up for Acacius in 532/3 highlights how much had changed since Severus held the see of Antioch and blamed Peter Mongus for merely having communicated with Acacius.[194] Only fifteen years after Justin's accession Acacius was glorified by the non-Chalcedonians—and later became a saint in the non-Chalcedonian tradition—not for sharing their persuasion, but for having lived in peace with the non-Chalcedonians.[195]

The non-Chalcedonians had realized that they needed to preserve their uneasy post-Chalcedonian past because it linked them to the pre-Chalcedonian past. The awareness that this recent past was important constitutes a post-518 development. It was not the purity of their past that worried them now (whether, for example, Peter the Fuller should be in the diptychs or not), but the danger that a Chalcedonian past from a non-Cyrillian papal perspective would take over their churches. This development can be traced back to the enforcement of the *libellus* and its remodelling of the past, which created a sense of common identity among non-Chalcedonians.

CONCLUSION: THE NEED TO ESTABLISH A CHURCH

Hormisdas' *libellus* focused on the foundation of the Christian Church and its history. It targeted the Christian past on several levels

[193] See Chapter 1 and W. C. Bark, 'John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina', *HTR* 36 (1943), 103.

[194] See above.

[195] The Coptic synaxarion venerates Acacius, who supposedly wrote a letter in which he confessed the crucifixion in one nature according to the doctrine of Cyril and Dioscorus, as saint on October 29: *Le Synaxaire Arabe Jacobite*, ed. and trans. R. Basset, in *PO* 3, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1909, 246f. See also *History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. B. Evetts, in *PO* 1, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 446, where Acacius became a non-Chalcedonian. However, Acacius was also in high honour among the Byzantines as the entry in the Suda (tenth century) demonstrates: *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii: *Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, ed. R. C. Blockley, Liverpool: Francis Cairns 1983, 474f.

and required every bishop to accept the papal view on the Christian Church, past, and faith. John of Tella even disagreed with the pope on what the foundation of the Church was. In the same way, the papal view on the patristic pre- and post-Chalcedonian past remained alien to eastern Christians. It differed in this from the Encyclical, Counter-Encyclical, and also the *Henoticon*. However, even if it may have been acceptable for some bishops silently to accept the papal imposition on what the apostolic and patristic past of the Church was, in combination with the requirements to purge the diptychs it was not. Both Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians in the East were concerned about the names in the diptychs. The discussion over Chalcedon increasingly became a controversy over persons, and this may have been the reason that so many bishops left their sees: the requirement to sign the *libellus* amounted to more than just a formal agreement and affected more than just the bishop's personal beliefs. The non-Chalcedonian bishops would have compromised not only their personal faiths, but the faiths of their communities and churches as well.[196] A change of the names in the diptychs made the bishops' downfall tangible and public. It may have been acceptable for some of these non-Chalcedonian bishops to add names to the diptychs, but a public condemnation of individuals—in the cases of Severus and Philoxenus—[197] who might even have ordained them, and replace them with a foreign tradition, seems to have been unbearable.[198]

[196] See Chapters 1 and 3 for lower clergy of cities which their bishops had left. The bishops probably could leave their church without disturbing the well-being of the church, as the day-to-day business was managed by a steward anyway: Justinian's *Novella* 67 forbade bishops to leave their bishopric for too long, and to be a burden to their home church, which had to pay the travel expenses. Apparently the average bishop liked to go to Constantinople, a habit which Justinian forbade; see Noethlichs, 'Justinian', 752.

[197] Severus and Philoxenus were certainly responsible for most ordinations of non-Chalcedonian bishops who held office in 518. See also Chapter 4.

[198] John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.6; *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, ed. Johannes Thurn, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000, 338 (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986, 232) mentions that Paul the Jew included the 630 bishops of Chalcedon in the diptychs which probably first of all included Leo (see also Chapter 1). This was different from Severus' pragmatic approach to some 'suspicious' names in the diptychs: he only accepted these bishops because they had been local bishops and were still in high esteem, but not complete outsiders like Leo who seems to have never been much cared for in the East.

An additional problem poses the question whether a person's condemnation brought along a desecration of their physical remains. Limited evidence suggests that the damnation of a person may have caused the expulsion of their remains from the burial place in the city or at least their relics from the church, and in case of his vindication the return of the physical remains. Peter Mongus, for example, possibly disinterred the remains of Timothy Salophaciolus from the episcopal burial ground and threw them out or buried them in a common burial ground.[199] In 518 the population of Constantinople requested that the relics (λείψανον) of Macedonius should be returned to the church, and the bones of Nestorians and Eutychians should be disinterred.[200] In the case of Tyre, where the population requested the restoration to the city of the bodies (σωμάτων) of Euphemius and Macedonius as well as Flavian of Antioch, this cannot actually apply to the whole bodies, but it may indicate that some relics of these patriarchs had been sent to Tyre.[201] If this was a general custom, it might have increased the bishops' hesitation to condemn any of their deceased predecessors if they were not absolutely convinced he had been a heretic.[202]

In any case, the *libellus* changed an important unit of the liturgy and thereby struck the non-Chalcedonian churches at the heart of their identity as it also altered the collective memory of every single church

[199] Liberatus in *ACO* II.5, 130.22–8; Theodore Lector 425 (Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1971, 118); see also Evagrius, *HE* III.17, Bidez and Parmentier, 116 (Whitby 152).

[200] *ACO* III, 74.26–75.1. Wigram, *Separation of the Monophysites*, 89, considered the latter phrase just 'a pleasant figure of speech for the extirpation of the last traces of their heresies'.

[201] *ACO* III, 84.12–24. In both cases, Constantinople and Tyre, it is questionable whether the relics of Macedonius could 'return'. As Macedonius as well as Euphemius died in exile it is not clear if relics of them were ever deposited in the churches of these cities.

[202] The desecration of human remains was of course already well known from the apostate emperor Julian (361–3), who desecrated the bones of Christian martyrs according to the homoian martyr tradition as it survives in *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn: Ed. Weber 1832, 546 (*Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, trans. Michael and Mary Whitby, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1989, 37) and Theophanes Confessor, *Chronicle* AM 5853; *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. Karl de Boor, Leizpig: Teubner 1883, 47 (*The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, trans. and commentary Cyril Mango and Roger Scott, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997, 77): see H. C. Brennecke, *Studien zur Geschichte der*

in the eastern part of the empire. With their tradition under attack, the non-Chalcedonians were denied the right to claim an apostolic past. Although there were several levels of tradition, it was not possible for the non-Chalcedonians to claim the pre-Chalcedonian Christian past if their tradition was broken in the time after Chalcedon.[203] Through his *libellus*, Hormisdas hoped to solve the discussions over Chalcedon and prevent any discussion in his days on what the normative past would be.[204] If it had been left to the papacy, the debates of 532/3 would probably never have happened, exactly because it was a discussion about the legacy of Cyril and who could legitimately claim this tradition. Together with erasing the non-Chalcedonian past of the last 70 years from the memory of the eastern churches, Hormisdas tried to replace it with a Chalcedonian tradition from a papal perspective. If the non-Chalcedonians had accepted this remodelling of the past, the controversy over Chalcedon would have been an episode in church history like the controversy over Nicaea with the non-Nicenes. Texts which have survived, only because the non-Chalcedonians resisted and preserved their tradition through their respective churches until today, would have been lost, and scholars would be even less able to reconstruct the controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries. Cyril of Scythopolis and his *Life of Euthymius* and especially his *Life of Sabas* would be regarded as authoritative on monastic life in Palestine—were it not for the non-Chalcedonian John Rufus, who through his *Plerophoriae* and his *Life of Peter the Iberian* reminds scholars today that Palestine was, at least partially, once a stronghold of non-Chalcedonianism.[205] Together with the names in the diptychs the records of the non-Chalcedonian tradition preserved in the churches would have been lost.

Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1988, 114–22.

[203] Jan Assmann differentiates between a 'kulturellen Gedächtnis' for the distant past and a 'kommunikativen Gedächtnis' for the time within the reach of oral history (three generations); J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich: C. H. Beck 1992, especially 48–66.

[204] See J. Assmann, *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Zehn Studien*, Munich: C. H. Beck 2000, 41f.

[205] Nevertheless, because non-Chalcedonian sources survive in Syriac only, they have found much less scholarly attention than their Chalcedonian counterparts written in Greek; B. Flusin, 'L'hagiographie palestinienne et la réception du concile

However, the non-Chalcedonians in the East resisted, and in exile they began to develop their tradition and faith independently from the Chalcedonians. They were not given any possibility other than establishing a rival church and offering it to the emperor as the true apostolic church.[206] In other words, the *libellus* set a process in motion in the East which culminated in the making of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

de Chalcédoine', in *ΛΕΙΜΩΝ: Studies presented to Lennart Rydén on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. O. Rosenqvist, SbyU 6, Uppsala 1996, 34f., speaks of an error of perception; Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma', 216.

[206] In the 'Plerophoria' handed to Justinian, the non-Chalcedonian bishops already stated that they offered this supplication as the orthodox faith to the emperor—in opposition to any other faith; Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 115–22, especially 115–17 (Brooks, 79–84; Hamilton and Brooks 246–52).

3

Monks and Monasteries

INTRODUCTION

Before news of the enforcement of the *libellus* had reached the eastern side of the Euphrates, John of Tella addressed the monks around Tella in his letter of 519:[1]

Since you know, my brothers, that all the Scriptures proclaim one Son, and [that it is] to one Son that the evangelists and the apostles attribute the miracles and the suffering, run away from any association of the heretics, who divide Christ into natures, *hypostaseis*, and likenesses. Instead, abide by this venerable teaching of the Holy Church, which has never accepted that those who resemble camels that chew the cud and whose hooves are not cleft[2] to dwell in it [the Church], and which has not been enslaved to learn a confused teaching of the peacock and the ostrich, for he who divides Christ into two natures after the union resembles the camel, which is partly pure and partly impure, and as a whole remote from purity. And he who attributes the wonders to the one, and the sufferings and death to the other, resembles the ostrich whose hoof is not cleft and chews the cud and is rejected because its hoofs are not cleft.[3]

John picked a highly graphic image in order to explain to the monks the difference between the teaching of the holy Church and that of the heretics. As the provinces of Osrhoene and Mesopotamia east of the Euphrates had numerous monasteries, it was important for the

[1] For further introduction to the letter see Chapter 2.

[2] Cf. Leviticus 11:4.

[3] John of Tella, *Statement of Faith*, fol. 226b (see *John of Tella's* Statement of Faith, ed. and trans. K. Akalin and V. Menze, TeCLA, Piscataway: Gorgias Press (forthcoming)); cf. Leviticus 11:13–15.

non-Chalcedonian bishops to persuade the monks of the legitimacy of the non-Chalcedonian cause. Scholars have emphasized repeatedly the role of monks and monasticism in the controversy over Chalcedon.[4] Although it cannot be assumed that non-Chalcedonianism attracted monks and ascetics in particular, ascetics and monks played an important role on the side of the non-Chalcedonians after 518.

John of Tella probably did well to choose the question of purity in order to show the monks the difference between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. Before his appointment as bishop of Tella in 519 John had been a monk himself and knew the issues that concerned monks.[5] Not only John of Tella, but also the non-Chalcedonian bishops Severus of Antioch and Mara of Amida had been monks before being elevated to their sees.[6] Philoxenus of Mabbug, who lived a monastic life in Edessa, might also have been a monk in a monastery, as well as Thomas of Germanicia and Sergius of Cyrrhus, who were both buried in monasteries.[7] At least three of the remaining forty-eight bishops

[4] For the time between Chalcedon and the accession of Justin it was especially Heinrich Bacht and following him Johannes Roldanus who showed the involvement and the power of monks and ascetics in the Christological debate; H. Bacht, 'Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431–519)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 193–314; J. Roldanus, 'Stützen und Störenfriede', in J. van Oort and J. Roldanus, *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, Leuven: Peeters 1997, 123–46. For a general introduction to monasticism which also discusses the sixth century see P. Rousseau, 'Monasticism', in *CAH*, vol. xiv, ed. Av. Cameron, B. Ward-Perkins, and Michael Whitby, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2000, 745–80. For a good introduction to Syrian monasticism see Ph. Escolan, *Monachisme et église. Le monachisme syrien du IVe au VIIe siècle: un ministère charismatique*, Théologie historique 109, Paris: Beauchesne 1999.

[5] John of Tella also wrote canons for his former monastery, Mar Zakkai near Callinicum. One of these canons concerning the diet of Nazirites has survived: *Syriac and Arabic Documents: Regarding Legislation relative to Syrian Asceticism*, ed. and trans. A. Vööbus, Stockholm 1960, 60f.; for the monastery see below.

[6] For Mara of Amida see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79 (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 208).

[7] For Philoxenus of Mabbug see A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1963, 22–30; for Thomas and Sergius see *Chronica Minora*, vol. ii, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 3, 4, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955, 227 (172). The former metropolitan of Amida, John, is said to have been a monk; Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 78 (Brooks, 53f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 208). However, a burial in a monastery did not necessarily indicate a monastic past as the example of Thomas of Dara indicates; see below.

from the list of bishops who refused to sign the *libellus* had been stewards of other churches, but others might have had a monastic past as well before being elevated to the episcopal see.[8] Some of these monk-bishops were perhaps relieved to leave the burden of their office as bishop and return to their former habit after being forced into exile. The *Lives* of John of Tella record that he 'begged [the bishops who wanted to ordain him] to excuse him', and later—after having been bishop for two years and having refused to sign the *libellus*—'joyfully resorted to his former anchoritic habits'.[9] John returned to his former monastery of Mar Zakkai near Callinicum, and other expelled bishops also tried to find shelter in non-Chalcedonian monasteries:[10]

> When he [John of Tella] had been a short time in this convent [Mar Zakkai], the adversary came thither also as well, and a second time the blessed man was again in banishment with his convent, with the rest of the convents, and with all the other bishops also; thenceforth they were driven to the outer deserts, rejoicing and exulting that they had been thought worthy to suffer persecution with Christ [Matthew 5:11f.] since the other bishops also were scattered over all the convents.[11]

The prominence of uprooted non-Chalcedonian monks and ascetics who came to Constantinople in the 530s among the evolving Syrian Orthodox episcopal hierarchy in the 550s and 560s is striking.[12] Over the years the non-Chalcedonian community in Constantinople grew

[8] For the list of bishops who refused to sign the *libellus* see Chapter 2 n. 43.

[9] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 50 (Ghanem, 60); John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 515.

[10] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 515. The *Life of John of Tella* by Elias does not record his return, but only the fact that he had been a monk there before he was elevated to the episcopal office (Brooks, 45 (Ghanem, 55)). The Mar Zakkai monastery may perhaps be identified with the monastery now excavated at Tall Bi'a; see the short report by M. Krebernik, 'Schriftfunde aus Tall Bi'a 1990', in *MDOG* 123 (1991), 41–70. See also G. Kalla, 'Das ältere Mosaik des byzantinischen Klosters in Tall Bi'a', *MDOG* 123 (1991), 35–9. E. Strommenger, 'Ausgrabungen in Tall Bi'a', *MDOG* 125 (1993), 7–10; *eadem*, 'Die Ausgrabungen in Tall Bi'a 1993', *MDOG* 126 (1994), 24–31. The final report will be published as volume 6 of the Tall Bi'a/Tuttul excavation results.

[11] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 515.

[12] E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951, 168–245. Besides Jacob Baradaeus, six out of ten bishops ordained for the patriarchate of Antioch came from well-known monasteries in the East. See also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972, 286f.

to more than 500 ascetics and monks – among them John who later became the non-Chalcedonian bishop of Ephesus.

Before he became one of the leading non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople, John of Ephesus had been a monk in one of the monasteries around Amida from which the monks were expelled. His texts provide scholars with important eye-witness accounts for Amida and its monasteries in the 520s and 530s, and secured his fellow monks and their sufferings a place in history.[13] John described the Chalcedonians as cruel torturers who showed no mercy towards the non-Chalcedonian ascetics. Susan Ashbrook Harvey has drawn a sensitive account of the situation of these monks and ascetics from a non-Chalcedonian perspective. She notes that 'John's writings provide an honest record that counterbalances the official (and Chalcedonian) histories', and J. A. S. Evans credits John with providing the 'eastern view' on these events.[14]

Although John's credibility on the sufferings he and his fellow monks endured should not be doubted overall, it is, however, questionable whether his account is balanced or representative for the situation of all non-Chalcedonian monks or of the non-Chalcedonians in general. In his *Church History* John of Ephesus records that:

> Monasteries, big and small, of the venerable monks that were in all the territories of Antioch, Seleucia, Qinnishrin, Aleppo, Apameia and Mabbug, in entire Arabia and Palestine, in all the cities of the South and of the North, in the Desert of the Hermits to the boundary of Persia, and also in the rest of the cities and regions in the entire East, were persecuted, cast out, pillaged, arrested and fettered, while detained mercilessly delivered to death by torture, and their property confiscated.[15]

Although scholars can in addition consult the *Church History* of the sixth-century non-Chalcedonian monk Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor and the

[13] An overview of John's life and works is offered by S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'Johannes von Ephesus', *RAC* 18 (1997), 553–64; a short introduction is P. Bruns, 'Kirchengeschichte als Hagiographie? Zur theologischen Konzeption des Johannes von Ephesus', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 65–71; see also Chapter 5.

[14] Susan Ashbrook Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and* The Lives of the Eastern Saints, Berkeley: University of California Press 1990, 31; J. A. S. Evans, 'The Monophysite Persecution: The Eastern View', *The Ancient World* 27 (1996), 191–6.

[15] *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 21 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 1999, 53). For Ps.-Dionysius' use of John of Ephesus' *Church History* see below n. 17.

Chronicle of the twelfth-century Syrian Orthodox patriarch Michael the Syrian, it remains difficult to verify John's account since Michael depends at least partially on John and all three authors focused mainly on Amida in Mesopotamia and Edessa in Osrhoene.[16] In other words, as the Dutch scholar Jan van Ginkel points out, 'our knowledge of the events and the extent of the persecutions outside Mesopotamia is very limited. As our sources of the persecution all have a Syro-Mesopotamian origin our perception of these events may be distorted.'[17]

It is evident, however, that the Chalcedonians expelled monks also from monasteries outside Mesopotamia and Osrhoene or at least disturbed the monks' daily routine. They did so in the 520s but also after the Council of Constantinople in 536, which then they regarded as the fifth ecumenical council. It officially condemned Severus as a heretic, and Justinian issued a law which ordered Severus' writings to be burnt.[18] Following this council and the condemnation of Severus, Ephrem of Amida, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (527–45), travelled through to the eastern provinces of his patriarchate in order to enforce the council's decisions. John of Ephesus remembered this journey as Ephrem's 'descent to the East', and accused Ephrem of having 'moved about in every region and town and expelled (monks from) monasteries, large and small, bringing down (stylites) from (their) columns, which he also destroyed, driving (hermits) out of (their) retreats, and forcing people with a sword, staff and barbarian army to receive the Eucharist'.[19] In contrast to John of Ephesus, Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, however, regarded Ephrem as 'a man just in his deeds', as able and successful, who 'won over many persons, some by subtlety and moderation, and some by threats of the

[16] An anonymous monk whom scholars call Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor has added the part to Zachariah Rhetor's *Church History* that is relevant here. For Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor and Michael the Syrian see below, especially notes 24 and 37.

[17] J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium', Diss. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 1995, 43. Only the second part of John's *Church History* provides evidence for the period under consideration here. Parts of it have survived in *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, (Harrak). For Ps.-Dionysius and his use of John of Ephesus see W. Witakowski, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē: A Study in the History of Historiography*, Studia Semitica Upsaliensis 9, Uppsala 1987.

[18] J. Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *OstKSt* 43 (1994), 105–53. *Novella* 42 from 8 August 536; see Chapter 5.

[19] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 38f. (Harrak, 64).

king'.[20] The Chalcedonian hagiographer John Moschus remembered Ephrem to have persuaded a stylite to come down from his column and be converted to Chalcedon.[21] Overall, it seems that John of Ephesus' account needs to be read with some reservation.

If indeed all monks from monasteries all over the East had been expelled as John claimed, it is hard to imagine how the Syrian Orthodox Church could have been established. When the non-Chalcedonian bishops left their sees, the non-Chalcedonians lost the intellectual resources of these cities with their libraries and scribes. The monasteries remained the main institutions which could preserve a non-Chalcedonian tradition, and where non-Chalcedonian priests could still administer non-Chalcedonian sacraments. Without monasteries and their scribe-monks and libraries, and without a sacramental church life, the non-Chalcedonian tradition and its intellectual resources would have been completely uprooted. The role of monks and monasteries in the 520s and 530s therefore formed a crucial factor for the establishment of an institutionalized non-Chalcedonian church. An assessment of the state of non-Chalcedonian monks and monasteries beyond the subjective picture offered by John of Ephesus shall be set out here.

RESISTANCE OF NON-CHALCEDONIAN MONKS: THE CASES OF EDESSA AND AMIDA

The areas around Edessa and Amida are well-documented due to John of Ephesus' writings, and scholars have accordingly focused their attention on events that took place here in 521/2. It must be pointed out, however, that these events present extreme examples of

[20] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.4, Brooks, 76f. (Brooks, 52; Hamilton and Brooks, 205). The Chalcedonian sources also regarded Ephrem as able and successful; John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVII.22; *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB 35, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000, 352 (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986, 243f.); Evagrius, *HE* IV.25, Bidez and Parmentier, 171f. (Whitby, 222f.); see also Chapter 4.

[21] John Moschus, *Pratuum Spirituale*, 36, in *PG* 87.3, 2883–6 (*The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. J. Wortley, CS 139, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press, 1992, 25f.).

non-Chalcedonian violence, and the response by the Chalcedonians demonstrates first of all their concern to restore social order.

When in 521/2 non-Chalcedonian monks around the metropolitan cities Amida in Mesopotamia I and Edessa in Osrhoene realized that Justin began to enforce Chalcedon and the papal *libellus* also east of the Euphrates, they tried to take preventive steps against it:

> They asked everyone, young and old, to declare in writing [*lit.* with their thumbs of their hand] that the Council of Chalcedon, the *Tome* of (Pope) Leo, and everyone who declared or confessed two natures in Christ after the union were anathema. And thus they all wrote and confirmed (the anathema), and those same things were also published on the gates of all monasteries on the outside.[22]

The monasteries around Amida and Edessa followed this example set by the monks of the Monastery of the Easterners at Edessa, and actively resisted the implementation of the *libellus*.[23] In fact, it seems that the monks used the delay in the enforcement of the imperial decree east of the Euphrates to prepare their resistance. They forestalled the *libellus* by forcing the lay population to sign their anathema against Chalcedon. The monks probably employed these public anathemas as a demonstration of their power and the strength of non-Chalcedonianism in this area in order to show the incoming Chalcedonian bishops that the new religious policy was not welcome. By forcing the lay population to take their side, they might also have hoped that their provinces would be spared from accepting the *libellus*—like Egypt. The monks were certainly aware of the strategic importance of their provinces along the border of Persia and the emperor's interest to maintain stability and avoid any unrest in these sensitive areas. However, stirring up the population against the will of the emperor was a severe provocation and forced the new bishops to crush the monks' resistance.

[22] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, Chabot, 27 (Harrak, 57, addition in [...] my own). John of Ephesus' account, preserved here in Pseudo-Dionysius, is, as always, unclear about the date when this happened. As his following paragraph is concerned with the expulsion of non-Chalcedonian monks in Edessa due to their resistance against Asclepius, the Chalcedonian metropolitan of Edessa 522–5, it is likely that the Edessene monks posted the anathema just before or at the beginning of Asclepius' tenure in 522.

[23] It cannot be verified that 'all the monasteries across Syria acted likewise' as John states. See below.

Asclepius Bar Malohe, the new Chalcedonian metropolitan of Edessa, used the doctrinal controversy over Chalcedon to come to power in Edessa.[24] As a cleric of the popular metropolitan Paul, who tried to stay in power without signing the *libellus*, Asclepius had Paul removed from his see with the help of an influential brother in the capital, and became metropolitan in Paul's place in 522.[25]

Once in office Asclepius proved to be a successful administrator of the Edessene church according to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor who, although calling Asclepius a Nestorian and an active and violent persecutor, considered the metropolitan of Edessa to have been chaste, just, and incorruptible.[26] John of Ephesus on the other hand did not address this, but drew a vivid picture of how Asclepius broke the resistance of the monks in the Monastery of the Easterners. Two days before Christmas 522, in the middle of the winter, Asclepius forced all monks, including the old and sick, who refused to hold communion with him, to leave their monastery.[27] Asclepius might have deliberately chosen the date in order to wear down the monks. The monks could neither celebrate the Nativity of the Lord in

[24] For the following see *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 24–6 (Harrak, 55f.), which contains John of Ephesus' account, and Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.4, Brooks, 74f. (Brooks, 50f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 203f.). A thorough study of (Ps.-) Zachariah Rhetor is a desideratum; as short introductions, see J. Rist, 'Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor: Überlieferung, Inhalt und theologische Bedeutung', in M. Tamcke (ed.), *Syriaca. Zur Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen*, Münster: Lit 2002, 77–99 and G. Greatrex, 'Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene: The Context and Nature of his Work', *JCSSS* 6 (2006), 39–52.

[25] Paul actually wanted to ordain Asclepius as bishop of Harran. Although John of Ephesus cannot find much sympathy for Paul because of his behaviour, both John of Ephesus and Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor affirm that people supported him in Edessa. See also Jacob of Sarug's warm letter (*ep.* 32) to Paul after his first return to Edessa in 521, in Jacob of Sarug, *Epistulae quotquot supersunt*, ed. G. Olinder, CSCO 110, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1965, 241–6 (French translation: *Les lettres de Jacques de Saroug*, trans. M. Albert, Patrimoine Syriaque 3, Kaslik 2004, 316–22). See also Chapter 1.

[26] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.4, Brooks, 75 (Brooks, 51; Hamilton and Brooks, 203f.).

[27] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 27f. (Harrak, 57). According to the *Chronicle of Edessa* this occurred Christmas 522; *Chronicle of Edessa* 831, in *Chronica Minora*, vol. i, ed. and trans. I. Guidi, CSCO 1, 2, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955, 10 (9); see also the edition by Hallier with useful commentary: L. Hallier, *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik*, TU 9, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich 1892, 154 (128). For the date of the *Chronicle of Edessa* see F. Haase, 'Die Abfassungszeit der Edessenischen Chronik', *OrChr* 7/8 (1918), 88–96; for its use in later chronicles W. Witakowski, 'Chronicles of Edessa', *OrSuec* 33–5 (1984–6), 487–98.

their monastery nor would they have the time to settle somewhere in exile before Christmas. At Christmas they travelled. Asclepius sent these monks on an odyssey through Osrhoene and Mesopotamia together with the monks from a few other monasteries around or close to Edessa and from the Mar Zakkai monastery near Callinicum. These monks finally reached the area of Marde, a safe harbour for expelled non-Chalcedonians probably until 525.[28]

According to John of Ephesus, at the beginning of Justinian's reign (527) the empress Theodora allowed them to return.[29] John is imprecise on what 'the beginning of Justinian's reign' meant exactly—probably the monks did not return before 530/1.[30] A manuscript containing the book of Daniel written in the Monastery of the Easterners is dated 532 by its scribe.[31] Although there might have been several Monasteries of the Easterners,[32] Wright in his catalogue of Syriac manuscript thinks this may be the Monastery of the Easterners in Edessa. As Edessa was one of the main cities of manuscript production at the time, this seems highly likely. If so, it would show that although the monks had been absent for almost a decade, the monastery remained intact and its intellectual life flourished again very shortly after the monks' return.[33] However, an internal split brought about another interruption as one group of monks left the monastery and called in the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch.[34] This time, not the Chalcedonians, but the former non-Chalcedonian monks initiated the expulsion of their inmates.

The other centre of resistance according to John of Ephesus was the metropolitan city of Mesopotamia I, Amida. Here the monks

[28] Severus' letters and John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints* mention that some of the non-Chalcedonian bishops hid there; see Chapter 4; see also the list of monasteries in *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 28f. (Harrak, 58). It is uncertain how many monasteries around Edessa were affected as some of the monasteries in the list seems to have been located in other areas (see Harrak's notes). These monasteries, with three exceptions, also appear in Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's list of expelled monasteries; see below.

[29] According to John of Ephesus Theodora persuaded her husband to allow this. However, see for Theodora and her position in the religious controversy Chapter 5.

[30] This would coincide with the return of the monks of Amida. See below.

[31] BL Add. 14445; see W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i, London: British Museum 1870, 26.

[32] See below.

[33] One wonders whether anyone remained in the monastery in order to prevent its destruction.

[34] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 29f. (Harrak, 59).

even prepared themselves to fight for their persuasion and demonstrated to the new bishop their unwillingness to give in. The Chalcedonian metropolitan Abraham bar Kayli succeeded the popular non-Chalcedonian metropolitan Mara, but the welcome for him showed that no peaceful arrangement between the new metropolitan and the monks was possible.[35]

When the decree arrived in writing that the council of Chalcedon was to be proclaimed, and this was made known to the zealous people, they gathered at the church and as if from one soul they were shouting: 'By no means do we accept the council and the *Tomos*.' And they made loose and threw stones vigorously. The *magistrianoi* and the bishop hid themselves, and at night the bishop departed to the Goth Thomas, the *dux* of Tella, to [obtain] his help. And they both sent to the emperor. [The emperor] sent Bar Yohannan, a ferocious man.[36]

Although Michael the Syrian copied this report in the twelfth century, he provides the best surviving account.[37] 'Zealous people' probably means the monks, but it might also refer to a combination of both monks and lay population in Amida under the leadership of the monks. Although probably invested with sufficient forces, the military commander of the area, Thomas, *dux* of Tella, hesitated to

[35] After his death, Mara's remains were transferred from Alexandria to the region of Amida and put in a martyr shrine in Beth Shurla. Apparently Abraham bar Kayli did not object to this; see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79f. (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 209) and John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 13, in *PO* 17, 197.

The date for the monks' resistance is not entirely clear. Michael the Syrian records the story under the reign of Justinian (see next footnote), but it is obvious that Michael introduces here a reflection of earlier times. However, as John of Ephesus (preserved in Ps.-Dionysius) says that Abraham first pretended not to profess the Council of Chalcedon, it might be that the new metropolitan waited before he enforced the imperial edict. He cannot have waited long, however, and as Mara had left the city because he refused to sign the *libellus*, Abraham's enforcement of the *libellus* came as no surprise for the monks.

[36] Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.26; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901, 296f. (222).

[37] Michael the Syrian remains important for this period since he records certain events which are lost in the other surviving texts. For him and his work see D. Weltecke, *Die «Beschreibung der Zeiten» von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199). Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographischen Kontext*, Leuven: Peeters 2003; for Michael the Syrian's method of using sources see J. J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium', Diss. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 1995, 46–68 and 82f., and Weltecke, *Die «Beschreibung der Zeiten» von Mōr Michael dem Grossen*, 133–52, especially 148f.

crush the well-organized rebellion which was certainly also strong in numbers. John of Ephesus speaks of up to 1,000 monks in the monasteries who may have found some support among the lay population in Amida.[38]

Perhaps uncertain about how to proceed against the rabble-rousers after he would have gained control over Amida, or afraid to be held responsible for possible bloodshed, the *dux* consulted the emperor first in order to enquire about what he was supposed to do in this unusual situation. Instead of ordering the *dux* to quell the insurrection alone, Justin sent a troubleshooter called Bar Yohannan. Although not much is known about him, his task of cleaning up the mess after things had gone out of order reminds the reader of Constantius II's hangman, Paul 'the Chain'.[39] Bar Yohannan and Thomas beat fifty people to death, four of whom were hanged, each on a gate of the city.[40] The corpses were left there 'until people were overcome by [the odour of (their) ste]nch'.[41] Although John of Ephesus obviously refers to the same events as Michael the Syrian, John held the new metropolitan Abraham bar Kayli solely responsible for these deaths.[42] In the wake of John, Abraham bar Kayli

[38] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 35, in *PO* 18, 607f. and 616; at another instance he speaks of 750; *PO* 17, 214. Michael the Syrian even mentions 1,400 non-Chalcedonian monks in the regions of Ourtaye and Hanazit; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.19, Chabot, 275 (187).

The *dux* of Tella and the *dux* of Melitene together were strong enough to fight a Persian army; see *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, Composed in Syriac* A.D. 507, ed. and trans. W. Wright, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1882, 51 (*The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*, trans. F. R. Trombley and J. W. Watt, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000, 56). Therefore the *dux* of Tella alone should have been able to crush a revolt of unarmed monks unless the lay population in Amida strongly supported them. But for the scenario that probably frightened him see below.

[39] See Ammianus Marcellinus XIV 5.6–8; XV 3.4; and XIX 12.1–16; *Ammianus Marcellinus*, vol. i, ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe, LCL 300, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1935, 32–5, 120f., 534–43.

[40] John of Ephesus describes it as if the men were crucified. He might have used this image as an allusion to Christ's death, but it is highly doubtful that crucifixions were still used as punishment. However, if the convicts were tied on a 'furca' or 'patibulum', this would come close to a crucifixion. About the possible abandonment of crucifixion under Constantine see E. Dinkler-v. Schubert, 'Nomen ipsum crucis absit (Cicero, Pro Rabirio 5,16). Zur Abschaffung der Kreuzigungsstrafe in der Spätantike', *JbAC* 35 (1992), 135–46 with plate 5.

[41] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 33 (Harrak, 61).

[42] This part of John of Ephesus' *Church History* survives only in Pseudo-Dionysius: *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 33f. (Harrak, 61).

became 'the archvillain of Syrian tradition' as Susan Ashbrook Harvey put it.[43]

However, to accept John of Ephesus' description at face value obscures the events at hand. John depicts this event as an example of religious violence and persecution on the side of the Chalcedonians, but the fact is that the monks in Amida formed an organized group which usurped state power in a metropolitan city close to the Persian border.[44] Abraham bar Kayli can hardly be blamed since the monks caused the chaos and the military quelled it. At stake was a full-scale insurrection against the civil officials of the metropolitan city of Mesopotamia I and against the imperial edict of enforcing Chalcedon.

Like the Edessene monks, the monks of these five Amidene monasteries underwent an odyssey as well, but for longer than the monks of Edessa.[45] During the next decades the Amidene monks could never be sure that the Chalcedonian authorities would not force them to move somewhere else. The destinations of these monks, perhaps as many as 1,000, differed from the Edessene monks. The location of the first exile (521–6) remains unclear, but in 526 the monks left for an area 'on the border of the territory of Amida, in the district opposite the hot spring of Abarne', which might have been west of the Euphrates. After Justinian came to power in 527, he ordered them to return. The Amidene monks returned to their (now, however, 'destroyed and demolished') monasteries around

[43] Ashbrook Harvey, *Asceticism in Crisis*, 62. Evans, 'The Monophysite Persecution: The Eastern View', 193, calls him 'the archfiend of Syriac tradition', but acknowledges nowhere in this article S. Ashbrook Harvey's work. Escolan, *Monachisme et église*, 360, calls Abraham 'le grand persécuteur des monophysites'. For Abraham bar Kayli see also Chapter 5.

[44] As noted in Chapter 1, before 518 the non-Chalcedonians might have had the same problem with unruly (Chalcedonian) monks and Severus of Antioch was accused of being responsible for the slaughtering of 350 monks. No doubt, if the non-Chalcedonians had become the church of the empire, Severus would have become the archvillain of the Chalcedonian tradition—and indeed, a meticulous scholar like Edward Gibbon recorded this incident from the acts of the ecumenical councils and called Severus 'the tyrant of Syria [. . .] polluted with the blood of three hundred and fifty monks'. E. Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. v, ed. J. B. Bury, London: Methuen 1898, 153.

[45] For the number of monasteries see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 81 (Brooks, 55; Hamilton and Brooks, 210); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.14; Chabot, 266 (171).

Amida in 530/1.[46] It seems that after the debates in Constantinople between the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian bishops had failed, the Chalcedonians exiled the monks again, probably in 533/4. They left for the West and settled in Gumathene close to the Euphrates from where Ephrem exiled them again when he made his famous descent to the East in 536/7.[47] Settled between the dioceses of Edessa, Amida, and Samosata, John, Ephrem's brother and satrap of one of the Armenian autonomous principalities, expelled them once more—again in the middle of the winter.[48]

John of Ephesus commemorates very movingly the sufferings of the non-Chalcedonian monks. However, the expulsions in 521/2 happened not solely on religious grounds, not even primarily because of Christological disagreements, but because of the provocations and insurrection of the monks. No final explanation can be given for all follow-up expulsions, especially in the case of the Amidene monks, but it seems that the Chalcedonians regarded them as dangerous outlaws because of their numbers and their violent potential with which they could threaten civil order. In the eyes of the Chalcedonian authorities these monks needed to be kept at bay.

The strong resistance in Amida, however, should not lead to the conclusion that east of the Euphrates the Chalcedonians now started to intrude a homogeneous non-Chalcedonian religious landscape. It seems rather to be the case that some of the most prominent Chalcedonian officials were recruited in this very region. Asclepius had been a cleric in Edessa under the non-Chalcedonian rule of Paul before he became metropolitan himself.[49] His case also demonstrates

[46] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 35, in *PO* 18, 619: 'when they had also completed nine years and a half in the first persecution dated from the expulsion of their convents, they returned'.

[47] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 35, in *PO* 18, 607–23. It is not clear where the village Hzyn in the district Tyšf' (the first place of exile) is. For the other places see L. Dillemann, *Haute Mésopotamie Orientale et Pays Adjacents*, Paris: Libraire Orientaliste Paul Geuthner 1962, especially figures III and XVII. For Ephrem of Amida's career see G. Downey, 'Ephraemius, Patriarch of Antioch', *ChH* 7 (1938), 365–70.

[48] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 40–2 (Harrak, 65f.). For the satrapies see N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions based on the* Naxarar *System*, trans. Nina Garsoïan, Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation 1970, 25–37, 75–125. The monks mentioned in Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.19, Chabot, 275f. (187) who were in Ourtaye and Hanazit, in the Armenian satrapies, might be the Amidene monks.

[49] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 25–28 (Harrak, 56f.).

that some clergy were not very concerned about Christological or liturgical questions: they furthered their careers by switching Christologies and political sides.

The Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem, and his brother, the satrap John, were from Amida, as had been their father.[50] When Ephrem sent his brother John to the Amidene monks, John claimed to be their son and a native of their city: 'I grew up under your care and in your monasteries, and I care about your welfare and your honour.'[51] He tried to negotiate with the monks, but they refused and John was forced to expel them. John was probably not the only official—military or civil—who had personal ties to non-Chalcedonian monasteries or even functioned as a benefactor to them. Nevertheless, he obeyed the imperial will.

Before becoming the Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida, Abraham bar Kayli, the son of Ephrem of Tella, was a notary but 'attached himself to Eutychian, the bishop [of Dara], who made him presbyter'.[52] Abraham oversaw the building of a bath there and Eutychian made him steward. Eutychian's successor, Thomas of Dara, had been steward of the church of Amida after a secular career as soldier. He remained non-Chalcedonian and preferred exile in 521 whereas his steward Abraham became the metropolitan of Amida. The non-Chalcedonian bishops Nonnus of Seleucia and Mara of Amida had been stewards as well—in the church of Amida at the same time as they were governors of Mesopotamia. Later both chose exile like Thomas of Dara.[53] It seems that once having become a bishop, a person felt more responsible for his church and did not switch sides easily. For lower clergy, however, it might have been less difficult and more tempting to convert to Chalcedonianism: they had not yet expressed their Christological persuasion as publicly as a bishop and were therefore less compromised when switching sides than a bishop. Their motivation might have been to gain one of the

[50] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 38 (Harrak, 64).

[51] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 40f. (Harrak, 65).

[52] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VII.6, Brooks, 38 (Brooks, 26; Hamilton and Brooks, 167); but see also *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 32 (Harrak, 60).

[53] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 78f. (Brooks, 53f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 208).

fifty-four vacant sees available after the non-Chalcedonian bishops went into exile.[54]

The *libellus* forced many clerics to make difficult personal choices. Acceptance or refusal of Chalcedon divided people in Mesopotamia and Osrhoene as well as in regions further west, although the proportions of Chalcedonians to non-Chalcedonians probably shifted in favour of the former in the western provinces of the patriarchate of Antioch. In Mesopotamia and Osrhoene the non-Chalcedonians probably constituted a majority. On the other hand, the names of some Chalcedonian officials indicate that they were of Syrian origin, Bar Yohannan as well as the *dux* Thomas, and some of them like Ephrem of Amida and his brother John certainly came from the rather non-Chalcedonian eastern provinces of the patriarchate of Antioch.[55] Neither non-Chalcedonianism nor Chalcedonianism seems to have been favoured by any ethnic or linguistic groups at this time. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the council of 451 divided people of similar origins as well as people who shared the same languages.

OTHER MONASTERIES IN THE EAST

Despite John of Ephesus' claim of persecutions everywhere, the situation west of the Euphrates proved to be different from the eastern provinces. The majority of monks here were not expelled, but were able to preserve their non-Chalcedonian tradition and thereby contribute to the establishment of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

According to John of Ephesus, Paul the Jew did not hesitate as new patriarch of Antioch (519–21) to persecute the non-Chalcedonian monks in his patriarchate. The sufferings of the monks, John wrote,

[54] For the lower clergy see also V. Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth-Century Syria', *Hugoye* 7.2 (2004) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol7No2/HV7N2Menze.html], pars. 1–21.

[55] Although it is said that Thomas was a Goth, that might have been just a term in Syriac for soldier; see A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* 1263 n. 53. Another Chalcedonian might have been Moses, the successor of Jacob of Sarug as bishop of Batnae, as he is not mentioned among the expelled bishops and may therefore have accepted the *libellus*; *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 27 (Harrak, 56).

'would fill numerous volumes'.[56] Scholars wish that he had written these volumes because the description of the 'persecutions' John presents is rather vague.[57] John's short surviving account makes clear that the Chalcedonians intended to disturb the contemplative and spiritual life of the monks. The Chalcedonians therefore took advantage of the fact that the monks had a well-structured day, and surprised them in a perfidious way. According to John, the Chalcedonians would stop by the monasteries at dinner time, sit down at the monks' table and eat their food. Monks in general were very concerned about the right diet and the supper might have been the only meal of the day for some of the ascetic monks. The disruption of this meal in the refectory, one of the few communal experiences the monks enjoyed together, left the monks 'weary and with tormented spirits'.[58]

Otherwise John is not specific about the deeds of the Chalcedonians, but he certainly exaggerates in stating that Paul persecuted the monks all over the East. As previously discussed, Paul was not even able to install Chalcedonian bishops east of the Euphrates, and it is unlikely that they were harrassed before the arrival of Abraham bar Kayli.

Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor records in his *Church History* a list of monasteries from which monks were expelled in the 520s.[59] Ps.-Zachariah begins his description of the expulsion of monasteries with the note that the monks were expelled 'from [the year] three until [the year] nine'.[60] As scholars have already noted, Ps.-Zachariah usually counts the years of the indiction, that is to say, Ps.-Zachariah believed the monks were expelled in the years 525–31. However, since one finds among the monasteries in the list the five monasteries at Amida, at least one of the Edessene monasteries, and the Mar Zakkai monastery near Callinicum from

[56] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 22 (Harrak, 54).

[57] John of Ephesus mentioned that he wrote a work on the persecutions (*Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 39 (Harrak, 64)) which is unfortunately lost. If John referred here to his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* this would indicate that he wrote at least part of it before he started his *Church History*; but see Chapter 5 n. 78.

[58] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 23 (Harrak, 54). For common life in the Amidene monasteries see A. Palmer's instructive account in *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur 'Abdin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990, 81–8, especially 82 on meals in the refectory.

[59] The second wave of expulsions and threats against non-Chalcedonian monasteries in 536/7 by Ephrem of Amida will be discussed in the next section.

[60] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 80 (Brooks, 55; Hamilton and Brooks, 209). Ps.-Zachariah-Rhetor wrote the years of the indictions in Greek.

which the monks were expelled in 521/2, it would make sense to read 'years three to nine' to mean the years of the reign of Justin, i.e. 521–7.[61] However, Ps.-Zachariah specifies later in the same chapter that '[year] nine' means the fifth year of the emperor Justinian (531). Furthermore, the monks of the Amidene monasteries did not return to Amida in 527, but in 530/1 and probably the monks of Edessa also returned then as well. The Amidene monasteries are not the first in Ps.-Zachariah's list, and it might well be that Ps.-Zachariah only referred to the first couple of monasteries in his list for which the years three to nine were valid, and he did not have information that the Chalcedonians expelled the monks around Amida and Edessa already years earlier. It seems therefore correct to assume that Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor meant 525–31.[62]

The list demonstrates that the Chalcedonians expelled monks from more than twenty monasteries in Syria I and II, Euphratesia, Osrhoene, and Mesopotamia I.[63] In other words, it confirms the expulsion of the monks from the Amidene and Edessene monasteries and adds fewer than twenty which shared a similar fate.[64] However, this list probably remains incomplete: John of Ephesus records three monasteries—in the area around Edessa and expelled in 522—not recorded in Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, and the Chalcedonians also expelled monks and nuns from monasteries in Palestine and Armenia.[65] It could be that Ps.-Zachariah

[61] Ps.-Zachariah's list mentions the monastery of Arches, which was located near Edessa, as well as a 'monastery of Edessa', but it is unlikely that this is the 'monastery of the Easterners' from which the monks were expelled by Asclepius as discussed above. Ps.-Zachariah mentions that a 'John of the [monastery of the] Easterners' and a 'Maron of the Easterners' were expelled, but this probably refers to other monasteries of the Easterners, maybe in Syria I or II; see *Documenta ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustrandas*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, CSCO 17/103, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae and Leuven: E Typographeo Marcelli Istas 1907/1933, 146 (101); against M. Mundell Mango, 'Where was Beth Zagba?', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983), 405–30.

[62] In general Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor is more reliable concerning dates than John of Ephesus.

[63] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 80f. (Brooks, 55f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 209–11); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.14; Chabot, 266 (171f.), takes this list from Ps.-Zachariah.

[64] These are in addition to several other monasteries from which only the archimandrite was expelled.

[65] For the monks around Edessa see above and *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 29 (Harrak, 58); for Palestine and Armenia see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25 and 27, in *PO* 18, 527, 546f., and 551; *PO* 17, 283–98 and below.

Rhetor did not care to give a complete list or that he recorded only the expulsions of monks from the most prominent monasteries.[66]

Even if not entirely accurate, the list can nevertheless be helpful: it provides a tentative picture of how many monasteries the Chalcedonians targeted with expulsions. When compared with letters from the later controversies among the non-Chalcedonians in 567–70 which offer through the letters' subscriptions a rare glimpse of the number of non-Chalcedonian monasteries mainly in the patriarchate of Antioch, it is possible to draw further conclusions regarding the percentage of non-Chalcedonian monasteries that were threatened with expulsion. From the subscriptions of these synodical letters by archimandrites, Honigmann and following him Littmann, Caquot, and Mango identify 84 monasteries in Syria I and II, Euphratesia, Osrhoene, and Mesopotamia I and II.[67] Another letter subscribed by 137 persons, mainly archimandrites and monks authorized to subscribe for their archimandrites, allows us to draw a similar picture of the monastic landscape in Arabia, Phoenicia Libanesis, and Palaestina II.[68]

If the numbers found in Ps.-Zachariah and in the first set of letters could be used for a comparison, it would suggest that only a quarter of non-Chalcedonian monasteries had to undergo expulsion. As several of these monasteries were prominent monasteries and assuming

[66] However, although several prominent monasteries are among those from which the monks were expelled, others mentioned in the list seem to have not played a major role in the sixth century.

[67] Until M. Mundell Mango proved in her article 'Where Was Beth Zagba?' that some monasteries in the non-Chalcedonian letters were to be found also in the eastern part of the patriarchate, scholars believed that the monasteries mentioned in the letters were exclusively to be found in Syria I and II (referred here as the northern part) and the others in Arabia (referred to here as the southern part); northern part: *Documenta*, Chabot, 145–55 (101–8), 161–5 (112–15), 166–72 (116–20), 181–5 (126–8); see E. Honigmann, 'Nordsyrische Klöster in vorarabischer Zeit', *ZS* 1 (1922), 15–33; E. Littmann, 'Zur Topographie der Antiochene und Apamene', *ZS* 1 (1922), 163–95; A. Caquot, 'Couvents antiques', in G. Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord. Le massif du Bélus à l'époque romaine*, vol. iii, Paris: Paul Geuthner 1958, 63–85. Southern part: *Documenta*, Chabot, 209–24 (145–56). See also T. Nöldeke, 'Zur Topographie und Geschichte des Damascenischen Gebietes und der Haurângegend', *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 419–44; Th.-J. Lamy, 'Profession de foi addressée par les abbés des couvents de la province d'Arabie à Jacques Baradée', in *Actes du onzième congrès international des orientalistes Paris 1897*, vol. iv, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1898, 117–37, and I. Shahîd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, vol. i, part 2, Washington, DC, 1995, 824–35.

[68] It seems that only six persons were not connected with monasteries.

that prominence would also find an expression in the size of the monasteries, the Chalcedonians exiled up to one-third of all non-Chalcedonian monks in Syria I and II, Euphratesia, Osrhoene, and Mesopotamia I and II. The sources rarely mention expulsions from monasteries in Palestine, Phoenicia, and Arabia, and considering the great number of monasteries recorded in the second letter (around 130 monasteries) the enforcement of Chalcedon was, if anything, less intense here than in the above-mentioned provinces.

Several objections may be raised against a close comparison of the two sources. First of all, the evidence leaves too many uncertainties. As discussed above, Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor does not include all non-Chalcedonian monasteries. On the other hand, also in the first letter three important monasteries in Syria are missing.[69] Furthermore, in the controversies among non-Chalcedonians in 567–70 some monasteries might have sided with the opposing non-Chalcedonian party from which no letters survive. That would mean that the number of monasteries might be higher than found in the letters.

Another objection would be that the monastic landscape may have changed considerably between the expulsion of monks in the 520s and the state of monasteries as is known from the letter *c.*570. Monasteries may have accepted the *libellus* under force and later returned to non-Chalcedonianism. For Arabia the policy of the Ghassanids, an Arab tribe in that area, and the mission of the non-Chalcedonian bishop Theodore in the 540s may have brought a considerable increase of non-Chalcedonian monasteries.[70] Although there was some continuity of monastic settlements, manifested by the fact that the same prominent monasteries can be found in Ps.-Zachariah's list and the letters, most monasteries were not impressive foundations lasting for centuries. Some of them were built very quickly; it seems that some monks even considered it their task in life to build as many monasteries as possible—like Addai and Abraham, who built twelve monasteries in twenty-five years.[71] Some of them might not have lasted for long, and monastic communities

[69] Honigmann, 'Nordsyrische Klöster', 17, but it is not known if these monasteries might have been Chalcedonian at that time.

[70] Theodore had been ordained bishop at the same time as Jacob Baradaeus; see Chapter 5 and general Conclusion.

[71] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 22, in *PO* 17, 299f.

easily split for a number of reasons. The group that left its monastery built a new one or settled in an abandoned monastery.[72] In other words, not all monasteries were stable communities, and a comparison between the lists should therefore be made with some reservations. Nevertheless, even considering these uncertainties, the numbers found in Ps.-Zachariah on the one hand and the numbers found in the letters on the other hand lead to the conclusion that the Chalcedonians forced only a minority of monks into exile.

THE ROLE OF MONKS AND MONASTERIES

Ps.-Zachariah's list often specifies that the Chalcedonians expelled only certain members—often the archimandrite—of the monastic communities from the monasteries. These individual cases will be discussed here in order to analyse how the Chalcedonians treated (or mistreated) non-Chalcedonian monks and monasteries. Thereby it may be possible to understand the motives for the expulsions and the Chalcedonians' perception of the role of non-Chalcedonian monks and monasteries.

At the top of Ps.-Zachariah's list stands the Thomas monastery in the area of Seleucia on the Orontes. Because the Chalcedonians expelled them, the monks under the leadership of John bar Aphtonia went to Qenneshre on the Euphrates and built a monastery there. However, the date of the expulsion from the Thomas monastery and the foundation of the new monastery seems to pose a problem: as discussed above, Ps.-Zachariah dates the expulsions to 525–31, but the non-Chalcedonian bishop Paul of Callinicum translated dogmatic (anti-Julianist) works by Severus in 528 'in the days of John bar Aphtonia, archimandrite of the St. Thomas monastery at Seleucia'.[73] How does this fit together? Scholars have concluded that

[72] The latter seems to be the case with James, the exorcist and his followers; see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 15, in *PO* 17, 224. They could also split because of doctrinal quarrels; see *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 29f. (Harrak, 59).

[73] Vat. Syr. 140; see J. S. Assemani, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum Catalogus in Tres Partes Distributus*, vol. i/3, Rome: Ex Typographia Linguarum Orientalium 1759, 232. For Julian of Halicarnassus see below and especially Chapter 4.

the Chalcedonians either expelled John and his monks twice (518 and after 528) or expelled them after 528 and before 531, and the monks then built the monastery at Qenneshre.[74] However, neither construction does justice to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's reliable note, 'from [year] three to [year] nine'. If the new establishment at Qenneshre was the later so-called monastery of Beth Aphtonia, it was not merely temporary, but became a well-known monastery. However, it is hard to imagine that the monks already called this monastery Beth Aphtonia in John's lifetime. Therefore, since three years after the expulsion the settlement at Qenneshre was probably still regarded as temporary, the note in the manuscript of 528 called John archimandrite of the Thomas monastery, although he and his monks lived in Qenneshre at this time (525–31).[75]

Nothing is said about why the Chalcedonians expelled the monks of the Thomas monastery in 525, but it might have been due to their learned archimandrite John, about whom an anonymous author wrote a short *Life*.[76] John was known to have been an author of homilies and other treatises, he ensured that his monks were taught in Greek, and he even participated in the debates in Constantinople in 532/3.[77] Therefore he and his monastery, located near Antioch, were a thorn in the flesh of the Chalcedonians, as the Chalcedonian Canope monastery near Alexandria had been for the non-Chalcedonian patriarchs in Alexandria in the fifth century. The Chalcedonian patriarch might

[74] F. Nau, 'Histoire de Jean bar Aphtonia', *ROC* 7 (1902), 97–135, here 99 (Nau presents edition and translation of John's *Life* with a commentary); A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn: A. Marcus and E. Webers 1922, 181; P. Krüger, 'Johannes bar āphtonājā und die syrische Übersetzung seines Kommentars zum Hohen Lied', *OrChr* 50 (1966), 61–71; F. Graffin, 'Jean bar Aphtonya', in *DSp* 8 (1974), 284f.; P. Bruns, 'Johannes bar Aphtonia', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 375. For the *Life* see John W. Watt, 'A Portrait of John bar Aphtonia, Founder of the Monastery of Qenneshre', in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, ed. Jan W. Drijvers and John W. Watt, Leiden: Brill 1999, 155–69.

[75] The monastery of Qenneshre also became known for its Greek learning and later produced a number of Syrian Orthodox patriarchs.

[76] For the *Life* see n. 74 above.

[77] John wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs and several hymns. See literature above. According to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.15, Brooks, 122 (Brooks, 84; Hamilton and Brooks, 253) John bar Aphtonia wrote a record of the debates and Sebastian Brock thinks this could be the Syriac account that survived; see Chapter 2.

have wished to silence this intellectually thriving monastery by banning its monks to the countryside.

A very prominent monastery in Ps.-Zachariah's list is the Mar Bassus monastery east of the Orontes near Batabu, which had more than 200 monks in the time of Simeon the Stylite in the fifth century. Notorious as a stronghold of non-Chalcedoniansim, it ranked first among the monasteries in this area.[78] Between 512 and 519, Jacob of Sarug, later the non-Chalcedonian bishop of Batnae (519–21), made an unpleasant acquaintance with Lazarus, the archimandrite of Mar Bassus.[79] Although Jacob anathematized Nestorius, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and the dyophysite Christology,

[78] For the location see the maps in M. Mundell Mango, 'Where Was Beth Zagba?', 411 and 414; for the figure of 200 monks: Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Religious History* XXVI.8, ed. with French translation P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, *Histoire des Moines de Syrie*, vol. ii, SC 257, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1979, 174–7 (English translation by R. M. Price, *A History of the Monks of Syria*, CS 88, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1985, 163). For the monastery see also Caquot, 'Couvents Antiques', 66.

[79] Letters 13–17, in: Jacob of Sarug, *Epistulae*, Olinder, 52–86 (Albert, 87–128); see also G. Olinder, *The Letters of Jacob of Sarug: Comments on an Edition*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift n.f. 34.8, Lund and Leipzig: Gleerup and Harrassowitz 1939, 33–48. For the scholarly debate on Jacob's Christology see T. Jansma, 'The Credo of Jacob of Serugh: A Return to Nicaea and Constantinople', *NAKG* 44 (1961), 18–36; *idem*, 'Die Christologie Jakobs von Serugh und ihre Abhängigkeit von der alexandrinischen Theologie und der Frömmigkeit Ephraems des Syrers', *Muséon* 78 (1965), 5–46 (here Jansma discusses extensively the correspondence of Jacob with Lazarus); *idem*, 'Encore le credo de Jacques de Saroug. Nouvelles recherches sur l'argument historique concernant son orthodoxie', *OrSyr* 10 (1965), 75–88, 193–236, 331–70, 475–510; not persuasive are P. Peeters, 'Jacques de Saroug. Appartient-il à la secte monophysite?', *AnBoll* 46 (1948), 134–98; P. Krüger, 'War Jakob von Serugh Katholik oder Monophysit?', *OstKSt* 2 (1953), 199–208; *idem*, 'Das Problem der Rechtgläubigkeit Jakobs von Serugh und seine Lösung', *OstKSt* 5 (1956), 158–76, 225–42; for new textual evidence on Jacob see P. Krüger, 'Die kirchliche Zugehörigkeit Jakobs von Serugh im Lichte der handschriftlichen Überlieferung seiner Vita unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Pariser Handschrift 177', *OstKSt* 13 (1964), 15–32; *idem*, 'Neues über die Frage der Konfessionszugehörigkeit Jakobs von Serugh', in *Wegzeichen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Hermenegild M. Biedermann OSA*, ed. E. Suttner and C. Patock, Würzburg: Augustinus 1971, 245–52 and *idem*, 'Die sogenannte Philoxenosvita und die Kurzvita des Jakob von Serugh', *OstKSt* 21 (1972), 39–45; 'Ein zweiter anonymer memra über Jakob von Serugh', *OrChr* 56 (1972), 112–49. Jacob's opposition to Chalcedon can hardly be doubted but he might have resigned from office in order to avoid being confronted with the *libellus* at the end of his life; see V. Menze, 'Jacob of Sarug, John of Tella and Paul of Edessa: Ecclesiastical Politics in Osrhoene 519–522' (forthcoming 2008). For Jacob's theology in general see T. Bou Mansour, *La théologie de Jacques de Saroug*, 2 vols., Kaslik: Bibliothèque de l'université Saint-Esprit 1993–2000.

Lazarus replied rudely that Jacob's letter saddened him and he openly questioned Jacob's faith.[80] Jacob answered ironically that if the letter had indeed proved harmful, he should not have felt sad because he should have burned the letter and 'rejoice in the Lord always' (Philippians 4:4).[81] The correspondence between the monastery and Jacob, one of the most venerated bishops in the Syrian Orthodox tradition, demonstrates amply the steadfast non-Chalcedonianism of Mar Bassus shortly before Justin's accession to the throne.[82]

It comes therefore as no surprise to find the monks of Mar Bassus in Ps.-Zachariah's list of monasteries forced into exile in 525. Before the expulsion, the archimandrite of Mar Bassus, Julian (possibly the immediate successor of Lazarus), sent some monks to Egypt in order to ask Severus to ordain priests and deacons for his monastery. Severus in his reply, dated to 522 to 527, did not mention any disturbances that the monastery had to suffer or even a threat of expulsion.[83] Considering Ps.-Zachariah's note that the Chalcedonians expelled the monks from 525 to 531, it can be concluded that the monks in Mar Bassus lived undisturbed until 525, and even had a few among their monks ordained by non-Chalcedonian bishops. That enabled the monastery to provide their members with the sacraments from a non-Chalcedonian priest and made them independent from the patriarch of Antioch and his local Chalcedonian priest or chorepiscopus. Since the patriarch of Antioch certainly considered it his solemn right to ordain priests in his diocese, the monks' unwillingness to submit to his authority might have caused the patriarch to expel them. In this period, Mar Bassus did not lose any of its non-Chalcedonian conviction, and in the later internal, non-Chalcedonian controversies it held its priority unchallenged among the monasteries of that region.[84]

[80] Letters 14 and 15, in Jacob of Sarug, *Epistulae*, Olinder, 58–63 (Albert. 94–100).

[81] Letter 16, in Jacob of Sarug, *Epistulae*, Olinder, 64f. (Albert, 104).

[82] Severus of Antioch may have corresponded with the very same Lazarus, whom Severus held in high esteem, despite the fact that Severus was bothered by the archimandrite's high-handedness; Severus, *Select Letters* I.11, Brooks, 52–7 (47–52).

[83] Severus, *Select Letters* I.59 and V.15, Brooks, 197f. and 394–405 (178f. and 350–9; for the date see 358 n. 1). Severus of course mentions the 'times of persecution'.

[84] It even convened conferences for the non-Chalcedonian archimandrites in 567 and 568. It might have been chosen for the conventions because of its central location and maybe because of its spiritual eminence; see Caquot, 'Couvents antiques', 84f. There are two unpublished letters concerning the Mar Bassus monastery, one by the archimandrite Julian to Severus, the other by Severus to Julian; see S. Brock, 'Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severus', *StPatr* 12 (1975), 17–24.

The fate of the other monasteries in Ps.-Zachariah's list remains, for the most part, unrecorded for the period between 520 and 540. The monastery of Romanus, ranked in fourth and fifth place in the subscriptions of the archimandrites in 567–570, might have been the same monastery which received Justinian's financial support.[85] This would suggest that the emperor might have supported the non-Chalcedonians outside the capital where, under the patronage of Justinian's wife Theodora, the non-Chalcedonian monks and bishops enjoyed some comfort and freedom.[86] The monks of the monastery of Mar Zakkai near Callinicum were expelled in 522 because the monastery had provoked Asclepius by posting the written anathema of Chalcedon on its doors. Asclepius might have found further cause for expelling the monks of Mar Zakkai on account of the fact that John of Tella had shought shelter there.[87] Mar Zakkai may perhaps be identified with the monastery found at Tall Bi 'a.[88] If this is the case two mosaics with inscriptions dated to 509 and 595 show that it was flourishing at the beginning and at the end of the sixth century. Except for Ps.-Zachariah's general note about expulsions between 525 and 531, nothing is known about how long the monks were expelled. The impressive archaeological remains, however, indicate that the expulsion did not disturb the overall development of the monastery.

[85] Honigmann makes this suggestion in 'Nordsyrische Klöster', 19; see Procopius, *Buildings* V.ix.29, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 343, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1940, 358f.; Caquot, 'Couvents antiques', 74f. However, an identification remains doubtful.

[86] For non-Chalcedonian buildings in Constantinople there is a debate concerning the Sts Sergius and Bacchus church (along with a monastery) for non-Chalcedonian monks in the palace of Hormisdas in Constantinople, but not all questions seem satisfactorily answered; see C. Mango, 'The Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople and the Alleged Tradition of Octagonal Palatine Churches', *JÖB* 21 (1972), 189–93; R. Krautheimer, 'Again Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople', *JÖB* 23 (1974), 251–3; C. Mango, 'The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus Once Again', *BZ* 68 (1975), 385–92; and J. Bardill, 'The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople and the Monophysite Refugees', *DOP* 54 (2002), 1–11.

The story that Theodora rebuilt the Monastery of the Column near Callinicum must be seen in connection with her alleged origin there as the son of a priest, and is therefore a medieval legend; see Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* XI.5, Chabot, 414f. (419f.).

[87] J. B. Segal, *Edessa: 'The Blessed City'*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1970, 191 n. 6, mentions another Zakkai monastery near Edessa, but Witakowski and Harrak in their translations identify probably correctly this Mar Zakkai with the monastery near Callinicum.

[88] See above note 10.

John of Ephesus' account adds a few monasteries that Ps.-Zachariah did not include in his list. Among them was the monastery of the famous non-Chalcedonian bishop and former Iberian prince Peter the Iberian, located between Maiuma and Gaza in southern Palestine.[89] This area formed the intellectual centre of the non-Chalcedonians in Palestine with strong ties to Egypt. According to John of Ephesus the monks there were 'expelled with the rest', but he leaves it to the reader to imagine how long before 536 that happened, and how many other non-Chalcedonian monasteries in Palestine suffered the same fate.[90]

Thomas, an Armenian and son of a satrap, founded another non-Chalcedonian monastery probably somewhere in Armenia around 514.[91] The monastery might still have been fairly small in 521/5; the Chalcedonians, in any case, spared it from expulsion. Later, however, when Ephrem of Amida came to the East in 536/7, Thomas was

[89] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 527.

[90] Among the monks expelled from this monastery was John of Hephaestu, who became after 536 a prominent non-Chalcedonian bishop in Constantinople. See also C. Horn, 'Peter the Iberian and Palestinian Anti-Chalcedonian Monasticism in Fifth- and Early Sixth-Century Gaza', *Aram* 15 (2003), 109–28, especially 126–8. About Maiuma, Gaza, and their monastic milieus see J. L. Hevelone-Harper, *Disciples of the Desert: Monks, Laity, and Spiritual Authority in Sixth Century Gaza*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press 2005, 10–31. The Palestinian non-Chalcedonian monks had a record of violence against the overlords since their rebellion against Juvenal in 451; see E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5 (1950), 208–79, especially 247–57. However, in the 520s the non-Chalcedonian monks formed no longer the majority among the monks in Palestine and were confined to the southern part. Nothing is known of any active resistance; see in general for Palestinian non-Chalcedonian monasticism A. Kofsky, 'Peter the Iberian: Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine', *LA* 47 (1997), 209–20; K. M. Hay, 'Evolution of Resistance: Peter the Iberian, Itinerant Bishop', in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, vol. i, ed. P. Allen, R. Canning, and L. Cross, Everton Park: Centre for Early Christian Studies 1998, 159–68; C. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006; J. E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2002; K. M. Hay, 'Severus of Antioch: An Inheritor of Palestinian Monasticism', *Aram* 15 (2003), 159–71.

[91] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 21, in *PO* 17, 283–98. John's chronology might be somewhat confused, but Brooks' note that Thomas started his monastic life in 524 is difficult to reconcile with John's account. John states that Thomas began his monastic life, did not wash himself for ten years, went to Egypt, and afterwards he and his fellow monks studied the manuscripts John brought from Egypt. John adds another twelve years until the descent of Ephrem of Amida in 536/7. If these ten years are not meant to be part of the later mentioned twelve years, Thomas founded the monastery *c.*514 and not 524. About the manuscripts from Egypt see below.

regarded as the spiritual leader in this satrapy and 800 non-Chalcedonians from this area assembled at his monastery, including village priests and a chorepiscopus. Thomas, being 'an example to all [non-Chalcedonians] who are in the district to rebel against' the authorities, apparently scared the Chalcedonians. They summoned the non-Chalcedonian monks to the *praetorium* of the satrap and requested them to accept Chalcedon, probably in form of the *libellus*.[92] The non-Chalcedonians resisted and the satrap asked Thomas to leave the district so that there would be no slaughter.[93] The non-Chalcedonians left the district and scattered in different directions. Thomas went to the district of Claudias, probably the same area in which the Amidene monks had settled between *c.*526 and 530/1, and he built two monasteries there.[94]

As in the case of the Amidene monks, the Chalcedonians' fear of hordes of unruly monks seems to have motivated their decision to expel the monks. The role of Thomas illuminates how powerful one person could be in the controversies, and the fact that he functioned as the monks' unquestioned leader and could lead a possible rebellion, might have influenced the authorities as well to vote for expulsion.[95]

Finally, Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's list mentions also a number of individual anchorites and archimandrites whom the Chalcedonians expelled from their huts or monasteries. In several instances it seems to have been easier and sufficient to expel only the archimandrite or any other individual monk resisting the new Chalcedonian policy instead of all monks. Besides the problem that the monasteries were part of the local economy, a good number of soldiers were required to expel hundreds of monks. And even in instances like the Amidene monasteries when the Chalcedonians used soldiers, they could hardly allow the soldiers to use their weapons against the monks. Severus' and Peter of Apamea's supected involvement in a slaughter of monks was remembered decades afterwards and the Chalcedonians would

[92] The *libellus* was renewed in 536 by Justinian and the patriarch of Constantinople; see Chapter 5.

[93] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 21, in *PO* 17, 296.

[94] See Dillemann, *Haute Mésopotamie Orientale*, fig. XVII.

[95] Although one needs to bear in mind that it was, of course, John of Ephesus' intention (and due to the genre of hagiography) to point out Thomas' strong (spiritual) position.

hardly have liked to risk establishing a similar memory of their deeds. John of Ephesus remembers soldiers to have been billeted in a village to which the expelled Amidene monks had fled. Instead of using their weapons to drive out the monks, the soldiers ate the villagers' food and supplies until the villagers themselves begged the monks to leave in order to also get rid of the soldiers.[96]

One of the expelled archimandrites mentioned in Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's list may be identified with the archimandrite mentioned in several manuscripts of this period. John of kafrā d-bīrtā was most likely the archimandrite John from the Mar Eusebius monastery in kafrā d-bārtā near Apamea.[97] This John is known from a manuscript dated to 535.[98] The manuscript contains parts of the proceedings of the Second Council of Ephesus (449) which did not survive in the original Greek because this council was not accepted as an ecumenical council by the western tradition.[99]

Probably the same archimandrite John who commissioned the copying of Ephesus II also requested and commissioned a commentary on the Psalms by Daniel of Salah. From internal evidence the writing of the commentary can be dated to 541/2.[100] John also received a letter from Thomas of Germanicia written after 535.[101]

[96] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 39f. (Harrak, 65); see Chapter 5.

[97] Honigmann, 'Nordsyrische Klöster', 19, regards 'kafrā d-bīrtā' as a misspelling of 'kafrā d-bārtā'.

[98] BL Add. 14530; see W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. ii, London: British Museum 1871, 1027.

[99] *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, ed. J. Flemming with German translation by G. Hoffmann, AGWG.PH 15.1, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung 1917; see below.

[100] The manuscripts are from later centuries; see D. G. K. Taylor, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Daniel of Salah's Psalm Commentary', in *Symposium Syriacum VII 1996*, OCA 256, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1998, 61–9; there is not much scholarly work about Daniel. See L. Lazarus, 'Ueber einen Psalmencommentar aus der ersten Hälfte des VI. Jahrhunderts p. Chr.', *WZKM* 9 (1895), 85–224; G. Dietrich, *Eine jakobitische Einleitung in den Psalter*, Giessen: J. Ricker 1901; P. S. Cowe, 'Daniel of Salah as Commentator on the Psalter', *StPatr* 20 (1989), 152–9; D. Taylor, 'The Christology of the Syriac Psalm Commentary (AD 541/2) of Daniel of Salah and the "Phantasiast" Controversy', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 508–15. Lazarus and Dietrich, as well as I. Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. i, Sharfeh: Typis Patriarchalibus 1904, 27–29 (26f.), offer short extracts from the commentary with German/Latin translations.

[101] Thomas of Germanicia: *Letter to Presbyter John of Mar Eusebius*, BL Add. 14532, fols. 142a–143a and Harvard syr. 22, fols. 15, 73, and 65 (?). The letter mentions Severus' journey to Constantinople and can therefore be dated to after

Considering the fact that John was one of the most common names at the time, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the archimandrite John, whom the Chalcedonians expelled in 525 according to Ps.-Zachariah, and the John of 535 and 541/2 were the same person. However, in the exchange of letters between Daniel and John preceding the Psalm commentary, Daniel of Salah indicates that he (Daniel) was the younger of the two men.[102] As Daniel had already become an archimandrite, he could not have been very young. In other words, the archimandrite John of Mar Eusebius must have been quite old, and it might well have been that the Chalcedonians expelled him around 525, but that he returned later and commissioned a copy of Ephesus II and a non-Chalcedonian Psalm commentary for his monastery.[103]

One of John of Ephesus' saints, Maro, who is said to have blessed John of Ephesus, appeared too powerful to the Chalcedonians to be forced to do anything. Two bishops of Ingilene left him and his monasteries unmolested. The third bishop tried to beat the saint in a debate and thereby also win over the laity in the neighbouring villages who venerated Maro.[104] However, most non-Chalcedonians monks were not untouchable. In fact, the Chalcedonians usually isolated the ringleaders in the monasteries and forced them to obey or leave. Abbi the Nazirite, another of John of Ephesus' saints, was told: 'If you will not yield, since you have been made an example to many, withdraw yourself hence whither you please.'[105]

Another non-Chalcedonian saint, Addai, chorepiscopus in his monastery, left the monastery but the other monks stayed.[106] The

535. The British Museum version contains only extracts (the beginning and a section concerning the followers of Zebad, a false bishop). For the problem of how to reconstruct the Harvard letter see Brock, 'Some New Letters', 20.

[102] Cowe, 'Daniel of Salah', 154; Cowe used the Armenian translation as basis for his article. A. Sunderland, 'Daniel of Salah: A Sixth Century West Syrian Interpreter of the Psalms', *ByzF* 24 (1997), 55, considers Daniel as more worthy, according to the way he is addressed by John.

[103] Already I. Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. i, 61, mentions that, but did not explain how he reached that conclusion; see also Cowe, 'Daniel of Salah', 157.

[104] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 98f.

[105] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 14, in *PO* 17, 214.

[106] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 8, in *PO* 17, 127.

monastery did not switch sides, 'because, after those who were conducting the persecutions had seen that he himself [Addai] had departed, they did not trouble themselves much about his monastery, but took all the plunder that they could from it, and left it'.[107] Unfortunately for the monks, the Chalcedonians established a pattern of confiscating property from this monastery – more than ten times according to John of Ephesus. When the monastery became so poor that it could not longer support its members, Addai, in exile nearby and still concerned about his former monastery, found new means of income by establishing a vineyard.[108] However, John of Ephesus is often vague about what the monks did after the saints about whom he wrote had left the monasteries. It seems therefore likely that at least some of the monasteries turned Chalcedonian.[109]

The evidence for other monasteries in the East besides the Amidene and Edessene monasteries provides only a small glimpse into the state of the monasteries in the 520s and 530s. What is preserved about the expulsions in the 520s, however, speaks against John of Ephesus and his image of persecutions everywhere in the East. It seems more likely that the Chalcedonians focused on stubborn and resisting non-Chalcedonian monks or archimandrites and a limited number of non-Chalcedonian monasteries. Why the Chalcedonians expelled monks from certain monasteries often remains obscure, but it may be that these monasteries posed a threat to the sovereignty of the Chalcedonians—either to their sacramental sovereignty through the ordinations of non-Chalcedonian priests, or to their intellectual sovereignty through the education of young men who could intellectually challenge the official doctrine of Chalcedon. The question of ordinations will be discussed in the next chapter, but the role of monks and monasteries as agents for preserving the non-Chalcedonian tradition needs to be laid out here.

[107] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 8, in *PO* 17, 128.

[108] Apparently the Cappadocians were delighted that they could now buy wine close by instead of travelling further south to Syria.

[109] See John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 14, in *PO* 17, 213f., where it is not clear what the other monks did after Abbi left.

MONASTERIES AND INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES

Following the council in Constantinople in May–June 536, Justinian issued a law that forbade the copying and distribution of Severus' writings and threatened violators with the amputation of their hand.[110] One of the reasons that Ephrem of Amida made his famous descent to the East in 536/7 must have been that he intended to burn Severus' writings and probably other 'heretical' texts as well. John of Ephesus focused on the physical sufferings of his fellow monks and remained silent about this issue, but Severus himself noted in a letter that Justinian's law might make people fearful of possessing his writings.[111] In another letter to the scholasticus Nonnus at Harran he referred to the events in a monastery, probably around Harran, following Ephrem's descent:

> In one of the monasteries he [a monk] was reading aloud this book [which formerly belonged to Severus] to those who were confessing the very same way of monastic life. They [the Chalcedonians] came there, he who was fighting with God and was condemned by an anathema from heavens, Cyriacus and those with him. They seized it from his hands, and inflamed a fire from much dry rubbish. They threw it so that it might catch fire, and when the fire was constrained and checked by the power of the spirit, which was in these words which were spoken by him in the Old and New Testament, and of those [words] of the teachers clad in God who interpreted [them]; [the fire] did not approach the inflammable material, but this book remained in these writings without fire and with the skin that it was bound which was covering it on the outside.[112]

If this monastery was close to Harran where Nonnus lived, it might have been the Qobe monastery which was outside Harran on the route to Edessa.[113] Asclepius had expelled the monks from the Qobe monastery before Christmas of 522. The exact location of the incident mentioned in Severus' letter remains unknown, but it seems

[110] *Novella* 42 from August 536; *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. iii: *Novellae*, ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, Berlin: Weidmann 1904, 263–9.

[111] Severus, *Select Letters* I.63, Brooks, 221 (199); see also Chapter 5.

[112] Harvard Syr. 22, fol. 60a.

[113] Mango, 'Where was Beth Zagba?', 413–15.

almost certain that he wrote these lines between 536 and 538.[114] The letter does not note an expulsion of the monks, and the non-Chalcedonian monks apparently were allowed to stay after their 'heretical' books were burned, or, in this case, after a miracle saved this book.[115] In other words, the Chalcedonians were not keen to produce non-Chalcedonian martyrs, but tried to ensure that nothing written against Chalcedon would be preserved.

Already in 518 Severus had been charged not only that he was against Chalcedon, but that he had written blasphemous works against the council. Now the Chalcedonians tried to cut off the non-Chalcedonians from these works which constituted their intellectual foundation in the struggle against Chalcedon. The manuscript of 528—with the note on John bar Aphtonia as discussed above—containing important dogmatic works by Severus proves that the Chalcedonians did not succeed in eliminating Severian writings.

A good number of Syriac manuscripts of the Syrian Orthodox tradition from the sixth century are preserved. Most of them can only be dated generally to the sixth century (or in some cases to the first or second half of the sixth century) on the basis of their handwriting. Very rarely did the scribe supply an actual date, and only a few dozen dated manuscripts from the sixth century survive, mainly in the collections of the British Museum and the Vatican.[116] Even fewer

[114] Although the letter does not actually state that the book contained writings by Severus, it seems to have contained non-Chalcedonian writings and was previously owned by Severus.

[115] For burning of books in antiquity see: W. Speyer, *Büchervernichtung und Zensur des Geistes bei Heiden, Juden und Christen*, Bibliothek des Buchwesens 7, Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1981.

[116] No manuscript with a sixth-century date can be found in the Syriac manuscript collections in Berlin (E. Sachau, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin 23 (2 Parts), Berlin: A. Asher & Co 1899), Birmingham (A. Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts: Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oaks, Birmingham*, 3 vols., Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons 1933–9), Cambridge (W. Wright, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1901), Harvard (M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue*, Missoula, Mo.: Scholars Press 1979, 21), Jerusalem (D. A. Johnson, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the Library of the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, Cascade Christian College 1987), Manchester (J. F. Coakley, 'A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library', *BJRL* 75.2 (1993), 105–99), Paris

manuscripts dated to the crucial period between 520 and 540 exist. Most sixth-century manuscripts contain parts of the Scriptures because ideally every village church would have had the sacred books, that is the whole Scriptures or at least copies of the Gospels and the Psalms,[117] but as discussed before, some manuscripts contained works related to the Christological controversy.[118]

Considering the costs of books, a personal library was a rare exception, and the rich non-Chalcedonian woman Caesaria (the Patrician) prided herself for owning 'more than seven hundred volumes in number of all the fathers' in Alexandria.[119] Abraham bar Kayli even put Christological controversies aside and allowed the personal library of his non-Chalcedonian predecessor, Mara, to be brought from Egypt to Amida. [120] Severus, forced in exile to move from place to place, complained of difficulties arising from not having 'everywhere at hand fitting testimonies and demonstrations from the Scriptures'.[121]

Major episcopal sees certainly had good libraries and professional scribes who could increase the number of volumes for their collection.[122]

(H. Zotenberg, *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaïtes) de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, [Paris:] Imprimerie Nationale 1874 with additions by J.-B. Chabot, 'Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques de la Bibliothèque Nationale acquis depuis 1874 (Nos 289–334)', *JA*, IX série, 8 (1896), 1–19, and corrections by F. Nau, 'Corrections et additions au catalogue des manuscrits syriaques de Paris', *JA*, XI série, 5 (1915), 487–536), or in Syriac manuscripts from Southern India (J. P. M. van der Ploeg, *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and their Syriac Manuscripts*, Bangalore: Dharmaram 1983). For a list and pictures of dated sixth-century Syriac manuscripts see W. H. Hatch, *An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts*, Boston, Mass. 1946, 58–87, who includes two sixth-century manuscripts which are now in collections in Milan and Florence. I am not aware of any Syriac sixth-century manuscript in monastic collections in the Near East.

[117] See John of Tella, *Canons* 14, in *The Synodicon*, Vööbus, 152f. (148).

[118] For example the copy of the Second Council of Ephesus or Severus' works.

[119] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 54, in *PO* 19, 188.

[120] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79 (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 209). M. Mundell Mango, 'Patrons and Scribes Indicated in Syriac Manuscripts, 411 to 800 AD', *JÖB* 32.4 (1982), 6, thinks that this collection constituted the library of the cathedral in Amida.

[121] On Mara of Amida see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79 (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 209); Severus, *Collection of Letters* 34, Brooks, 272.

[122] C. Rapp, 'Christians and their Manuscripts in the Greek East in the Fourth Century', in *Scritture, Libri e Testi nelle Aree Provinciali di Bisanzio*, ed. G. Cavallo, G. De Gregorio, and M. Maniaci, vol. i, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 1991, 127–48.

Edessa seems to have been prominent in producing manuscripts in the sixth century, and maybe also Egypt.[123] Around 524, Thomas the Armenian went to Egypt to buy manuscripts, 'many great books of all the fathers'.[124] As Thomas was Armenian and had received a Greek education in Berytus, Antioch, and other places, he probably bought in Egypt Greek manuscripts with 'commentaries and exhortations and dogmatics' of the fathers.

Next to major episcopal sees, monasteries were probably the most prominent places where manuscripts were produced and stored in monastic libraries. Some manuscripts were produced outside monasteries, but then donated by a benefactor to the library of a monastery: a copy of the Pauline Epistles shows that an anonymous benefactor gave it to a convent in Edessa in 534.[125] Others were produced for monasteries as was the case with a copy of the book of Ezekiel that scribes produced in Edessa in 541 and which two monks bought for their monastery.[126] Another note in a Syriac manuscript shows that monks copied a manuscript containing the book of Daniel in the Monastery of the Easterners in 532.[127] Monasteries were a place of clerical learning at this time, and novices in the non-Chalcedonian monasteries probably had to copy the Scriptures for several years as part of their education.[128] Marlia Mango remarks that it 'is possible to compare the situation of the Monophysite monasteries of the sixth and seventh centuries with that of the Studite monasteries during Iconoclasm, when a forced isolation from cathedral or patriarchal libraries stimulated scribal activity'.[129]

[123] For Edessa see Mango, 'Patrons and Scribes', 5.

[124] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 21, in *PO* 17, 293.

[125] BL Add. 14479; see Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i, 86.

[126] BL Add. 17107; see Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i, 23.

[127] BL Add. 14445; see Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. i, 26. See above.

[128] John of Tella, *Canons* 27, in *The Synodicon*, 156 (151); John complained that parents sent their children to far away countries. Instead, he said, they should give them to monasteries where they 'read books and [...] learn the conduct of the fear of God'. *Letter which one of the venerable bishops wrote*, Canon 2, in *The Synodicon*, 180f. (171f.), requested that uninstructed clergy did penance, preferably in a monastery, so that they could learn the orders of the church. For novices copying the scriptures see Rapp, 'Christians and their Manuscripts in the Greek East in the Fourth Century', 144.

[129] Mango, 'Patrons and Scribes', 6.

The Mar Eusebius monastery had a monk assigned as the keeper of the 'treasury of books', which indicates a library of considerable size, including the Acts of Ephesus II and Daniel of Salah's Psalm Commentary.[130] Concerning Daniel's commentary David Taylor notes that 'Daniel's main concern is the christological interpretation of the Psalms.'[131] According to Taylor, it was not the Chalcedonians who presented the main threat for Daniel, but rather the 'Phantasiasts', the non-Chalcedonians who opposed Severus of Antioch and followed the Christology of Julian of Halicarnassus.[132] Therefore, on the basis of the two manuscripts known from this monastery and from the period 535–41/2 (Acts of Ephesus II and Psalm Commentary), one may conclude that the Mar Eusebius monastery produced manuscripts as ready-to-hand intellectual resources in its strife against Chalcedonian and Julianist opponents.

Some of the non-Chalcedonian monasteries brought forth highly educated bilingual monks who were later elevated to the office of bishop or metropolitan. Mara, the non-Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida before Abraham bar Kayli, having been educated in the Thomas monastery of John bar Aphtonia, was fluent in Greek, and the same is said about John of Tella.[133] Whereas John of Tella wrote in Syriac, Mara wrote in Greek.[134]

However, it might not have been the norm that non-Chalcedonian monasteries educated their Syrian monks in Greek. As seen above, some of Severus' works written against Julian of Halicarnassus probably shortly after 520 were quickly translated for an audience of such

[130] *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode*, Flemming, 158f.

[131] Taylor, 'The Christology of the Syriac Psalm Commentary', 509.

[132] Although Taylor notes that the commentary was also directed against the Nestorians, he is not sure whether this means the Chalcedonians (slanderously called Nestorians by the non-Chalcedonians) or the Christians in Persia; Taylor, 'The Christology of the Syriac Psalm Commentary', 510f. For Julian see R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa Controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'Incorruptibilité du Corps du Christ*, Leuven: P. Smeesters 1924; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989, 83–116; and C. Kannengiesser and M. Stein, 'Iulianos VI', *RAC* 19 (2001), 505–8. For the historical aspects of the debate see Chapter 4.

[133] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 79 (Brooks, 54; Hamilton and Brooks, 208); for John of Tella see Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 39 (Ghanem, 49).

[134] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.7, Brooks, 83 (Brooks, 57; Hamilton and Brooks, 213).

works who could not read Greek.[135] Also the manuscript of the proceedings of Ephesus II in the Mar Eusebius monastery in kafrā d-bārtā, which was a copy of a Syrian translation, shows that the proceedings of this council were made available in Syriac for non-Chalcedonian monks who could not read Greek.[136]

Certainly not all non-Chalcedonian monasteries were as well stocked with non-Chalcedonian writings as the Mar Eusebius or the Thomas monasteries. Most of the non-Chalcedonian monasteries also lacked an archimandrite as active as John of Mar Eusebius, as learned as John bar Aphtonia, or as rich as Thomas, who could afford the acquisition of a great library. The monasteries discussed here were exceptional, and it cannot be generalized that all non-Chalcedonian monasteries had comparable intellectual resources. However, the outstanding intellectual resources of these monasteries may have been exactly the reason why the Chalcedonians expelled the monks from them.

CONCLUSION

Much is lacking in the understanding of the state of the monasteries in the 520s and 530s. It will never be disclosed how many monks the Chalcedonians expelled, nor will exact statistics ever be available as to which monasteries the Chalcedonians mistreated.[137] More importantly,

[135] For bilingualism in Syria and Mesopotamia see S. Brock, 'Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac', in *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*, ed. A. Dietrich, AAWG.PH 96, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1975, 80–108, and more recently D. Taylor, 'Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia', in *Bilingualism in the Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, ed. J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002, 298–331. For Severus' anti-Julianist treatises see below.

[136] As the scribe John states that he only copied the manuscript, it is likely that his model had already been translated into Syriac—maybe already shortly after 449 or 451.

[137] Several areas where non-Chalcedonian monasteries existed are not mentioned in Ps.-Zachariah's list. Especially noteworthy is Palestine, but Ps.-Zachariah also remains silent about the situation in the patriarchate of Constantinople where non-Chalcedonianism must have been present, even if not strong; for Palestinian non-Chalcedonian monasticism see above; for the fact that there were believers, for example, in Chios and that the later non-Chalcedonian hierarchy had sees, at least formally, in the patriarchate of Constantinople see Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés*.

it is still unclear how the Chalcedonians implemented Chalcedon: was it more or less up to the local bishops to deal with heterodox monasteries in their areas?

Perhaps asking this question approaches the problem from the wrong angle. That is to say, John of Ephesus and the other exclusively non-Chalcedonian sources have led scholars to see the problem from the wrong perspective, in other words, from the perspective of the monks and monasteries. It might be more helpful to imagine oneself in the position of the Chalcedonian bishops in the East. There can be no doubt that Justin and the union with Rome in 518 brought for the Chalcedonians a more-than-welcome change in the religious policy of the empire. Fifty-four Chalcedonians, among them Asclepius, Abraham bar Kayli, and Ephrem of Amida, were ordained bishops and took up their sees throughout cities in the East. They could hope for a Chalcedonian future, but experience must have taught them how fickle religious policy had become in the Roman empire. When they took up their sees, it was not guaranteed that the shift to a Chalcedonian policy was definite. The emperor had assured them of his support, but nevertheless, it was, in part, their responsibility to push this policy through. The example of Paul the Jew should have warned them that they were obliged to use their new positions in a reasonable and responsible manner.

The Chalcedonians' fear of failing to stay in control and of being exposed to unruly monks runs through the non-Chalcedonian sources, even if this is never explicitly stated. Thanks to the Amidene monks, the *adventus* of Abraham bar Kayli in Amida became a disaster and was a blow to Justin's new religious policy. During the next two decades the authorities ensured that these monks were never given another chance to play out their power, and Abraham bar Kayli probably took preventive steps wherever crowds of non-Chalcedonian monks could pose a potential danger to the public order.[138] The goal of the Chalcedonians must have been to rule the eastern provinces without alienating the population. Taking as indicative the fact that Abraham bar Kayli ruled in Amida for thirty years, and that Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians sat side-by-side in his church, the Chalcedonians seem to have been pretty successful in

[138] See the example of Thomas the Armenian.

at least restoring social order and controlling the formerly unruly areas.[139]

What becomes evident from the sources is the difference between Amidene and Edessene monasteries on the one hand and monasteries outside Mesopotamia and Osrhoene on the other hand. Whereas the monasteries east of the Euphrates had years to perceive the change of the religious landscape in Syria and to prepare their resistance, the other monasteries west of the Euphrates were exposed earlier to their new overlords. The Chalcedonians harassed the non-Chalcedonian monasteries beginning in 519, but perhaps not before 525 did the Chalcedonians expel monks. In his tenure (519–21), Paul the Jew might have already tried to shut down some non-Chalcedonian monasteries, but this was only temporarily crowned with success. Slowly the Chalcedonians realized that Chalcedonianism could not win if the non-Chalcedonian monasteries remained untouched as intellectual centres of resistance, and by 525 they started to disturb non-Chalcedonian monastic life more systematically.

The non-Chalcedonian monasteries in and around the metropolitan cities Amida and Edessa were confronted two years later with the implementation of the *libellus*, and actively resisted the new religious policy. The monks around Edessa provoked the authorities non-violently and, as a result, were exiled for around ten years. As the Amidene monks resisted violently, they were not even given in exile a chance to settle for the next two decades. The Chalcedonians destroyed their monasteries and set an example to be remembered by the non-Chalcedonians that they did not tolerate any insurrection against the imperial policy and its officials. But the case of these Amidene monasteries so vividly described by John of Ephesus remains unparalleled, not only because these monks had a historian among them who preserved their fate, but also because it remains the only instance of organized violence among the non-Chalcedonian monasteries in the East.

In general, the non-Chalcedonian monks were too numerous to be treated like their bishops, that is, to be forced to sign the *libellus* or to

[139] See John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 101–3. This does not imply that the Chalcedonians were able to convince a majority of the population of the *libellus*' or Chalcedon's legitimacy.

be exiled. However, the Chalcedonians needed to control their bishoprics and therefore also took care that the non-Chalcedonian monasteries would not become centres of non-Chalcedonian resistance. John's account of how the Chalcedonians attempted to disrupt the everyday monastic life indicates that the Chalcedonians wanted to make the monks feel insecure and weary. They should give up their resistance against Chalcedon in order to be allowed to live an undisturbed and contemplative life.

The Chalcedonians needled the non-Chalcedonian monks, but they avoided having blood on their hands. However, this does not mean that the Chalcedonians were not tempted to let the harsh winter kill non-Chalcedonian monks. The Chalcedonians expelled the Edessene monks in 524 and the Amidene monks in 536/7, both in wintertime. Furthermore, John also mentions harsh weather conditions in the winter of the possible expulsions under Paul the Jew in 519/20.[140] However, it is not clear whether this is an additional burden unrelated to the deeds of the Chalcedonians or whether the Chalcedonians intentionally harassed the monks in the winter.

From 525 the Chalcedonians expelled monks from monasteries who presented an intellectual threat to them. Monasteries were influential institutions in these areas and offered many a 'way of life'. The fact that the Armenian Thomas did not aspire to the career of his father, as a satrap, but found it more fulfilling to become one of the non-Chalcedonian monks, demonstrates how influential monasticism was in this area. It attracted the elite, and Thomas became a non-Chalcedonian archimandrite whom the Chalcedonians had to fear. Educated as he was and ensuring that his monastery maintained a great library stacked with non-Chalcedonian texts, he and his disciples could theologically challenge the Chalcedonians. The Chalcedonians remained unable during these years to break into the non-Chalcedonian monastic landscape. They could substitute bishops, but colonies of non-Chalcedonian monks could not be substituted by Chalcedonian monks. The Mar Eusebius monastery survived the 520s and 530s without losing its non-Chalcedonian persuasion and—if the commissions of manuscripts by the archimandrite John can be taken as indicative—without any decline in manuscript productivity. As Daniel

[140] See above; *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 22f. (Harrak, 54).

bar Salah's monumental Psalm commentary engaged not in the quarrels between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians but in an inner non-Chalcedonian controversy, one may regard this as a sign of the strength of non-Chalcedonianism. Similarly, the quick translation of Severus' anti-Julianist treatises into Syriac demonstrates that not all intellectual rescources were directed against the Chalcedonians.[141]

Probably not only the intellectual resources of the non-Chalcedonian monasteries but also their sacramental life posed a threat to the territorial integrity of the Chalcedonian churches. The Mar Bassus monastery could regulate their sacramental life to such an extent that, bypassing the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, the monks received their ordinations from non-Chalcedonian bishops. If the example of Mar Bassus was only one among many, the non-Chalcedonian monasteries might have been islands of non-Chalcedonian church life and sacraments next to Chalcedonian cities. By leaving aside most of the monasteries the Chalcedonians could not totally cut off the non-Chalcedonians from non-Chalcedonian sacraments. Therefore the necessity arises to analyse the heart of non-Chalcedonian church life: their sacraments, their liturgy, and the establishment of an ecclesiastical hierarchy.

[141] The historical impact of Julian of Halicarnassus—to whose theological understanding even Justinian converted at the very end of his life—and the Julianists is not yet clear, and, considering our sources, might never be fully understood (but see also Chapter 4). However, Severus' anti-Julianist treatises clearly demonstrate Julian's theological influence; see A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989, 82–116.

4

Towards a Church: Sacraments, Canons, Liturgy, and Priests

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth-century French cardinal Henri de Lubac, who had been a force behind the decisions of Vatican II and was responsible for the foundation of the patristic 'Sources chrétiennes' series, discusses the Eucharist and its importance for the Church in his book *Corpus Mysticum.*[1] He shows that for the Church Fathers and also in the early Middle Ages the Eucharist was the *Corpus Mysticum* before the meaning of the 'mystical body' shifted in the later Middle Ages and was applied to the Church as a whole. As the *Corpus Mysticum*, the Eucharist is the foundational element of the Church, not in a structural but in a spiritual sense. It summarizes the New Testament and 'Christ in his Eucharist' is the heart of the Church.[2] The Church makes the Eucharist: 'it was principally to that end that her [the Church's] priesthood was instituted. "Do this in memory of me." '[3] To turn the argument on its head, de Lubac concludes that God accepts the Church's sacrifice and prayer 'because the Eucharist, in its turn, makes the Church'.[4]

[1] De Lubac's main study on the Eucharist is *Corpus Mysticum. L'Eucharistie et l'Église au Moyen Age. Étude historique*, Paris: Aubier 1949. However, his understanding of the Eucharist runs through his later works as well.

[2] H. de Lubac, *The Splendour of the Church*, London: Sheed & Ward 1956, 113.

[3] De Lubac, *Splendour*, 93.

[4] De Lubac, *Splendour*, 106. See also P. McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1993.

Although de Lubac discusses the Eucharist from a Catholic perspective, his observation applies also to the struggle of the non-Chalcedonians in the 520s and 530s. Without the Eucharist there could be no Church and without the Church there could be no sacraments like the Eucharist. After the non-Chalcedonian bishops had left their sees, the Chalcedonians had—at least officially—erased non-Chalcedonian church life in the patriarchate of Antioch. The new Chalcedonian bishops supervised the churches in their provinces, changed the names in the diptychs assuring a Chalcedonian liturgy, and offered Chalcedonian sacraments. The non-Chalcedonian bishops forbade their laity to take part in Chalcedonian church life—even to go to church services without taking communion.[5] The bishops demanded a disassociation from the Chalcedonians which became most visible in the refusal to accept the Chalcedonian Eucharist.

This episcopal request was only realistic if non-Chalcedonian sacraments were offered somewhere. Monasteries may have presented islands of non-Chalcedonian church life in the patriarchate of Antioch at the beginning of the 520s.[6] In addition, the area of Marde, close to the Persian border, was a safe harbour for non-Chalcedonians probably until around 525.[7] Therefore, the patriarchate of Antioch was only superficially Chalcedonian by 522, and

[5] Severus, *Select Letters* IV.10, Brooks, 306–9 (272–5); already John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 80, regarded this as punishable; see also V. Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma. Johannes Rufus, das Konzil von Chalkedon und die wahre Kirche', in J. Hahn and Ch. Ronning, *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2003, 215–32.

[6] See Chapter 3. This, of course, was not the case with the monasteries around Edessa and Amida.

[7] Severus, *Select Letters* V.15, Brooks, 394–405 (350–9) seems to imply (p. 395 (352)) that the non-Chalcedonian bishops had already left Marde when he wrote this letter probably before 525 (as the archimandrite of Mar Bassus asked Severus for the ordination of deacons and priests; see Chapter 3). Today the caves high above the Syrian Orthodox monastery of Deyrulzafaran outside Marde give an idea how the bishops and monks had lived there for years. Although it is unclear where exactly they hid, this location was so remote, but nevertheless relatively close to the city of Marde, that it would have made a good place of hiding. Later the Syrian Orthodox built rock churches and monasteries and monks lived there at least until the nineteenth century (as a Syrian Orthodox priest informed me in Marde). For the rock churches, Mary monastery, and Jacob monastery there, see Gernot Wiener, *Christliche Kultbauten im Tur 'Abdin*, vol. iv/1, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1981/2, 144–66 (in 'Textband') and plates 127–46 (in 'Tafelband').

pockets of non-Chalcedonian church life—probably often attached to monasteries—survived.

However, the new overlords threatened these pockets of non-Chalcedonian church life. Severus' letters concerning the ordination of priests for the Mar Bassus monastery demonstrate that non-Chalcedonian church life existed, while they indicate at the same time the problem of an ecclesiastical hierarchy in exile: non-Chalcedonians, perhaps especially monks, were able to bypass their Chalcedonian overlords and ask their exiled bishops for ordinations and pastoral advice. However, this system had to bridge the geographical distance between community and episcopal shepherd and could therefore only be a temporary solution.

In the long run no non-Chalcedonian church life could survive if the hierarchy in the patriarchate of Antioch was exclusively Chalcedonian and the bishops would only ordain Chalcedonian priests. The lack of clergy who could provide non-Chalcedonian sacraments became the greatest concern of the non-Chalcedonians. But the urgency of this matter could only be understood after the non-Chalcedonians reflected on their current situation and realized the absolute necessity for ordaining new priests.

Like their Chalcedonian colleagues, the non-Chalcedonian bishops were probably aware of the fickleness of the imperial religious policy, and might have hoped that the future would be more in their favour.[8] However, the thoroughness with which the *libellus* was enforced by 522 created a shortage of clergy shortly afterwards and forced the non-Chalcedonian bishops to reconsider the situation. They not only claimed their ecclesiastical legitimacy from exile against the new Chalcedonian bishops, but they also started to ordain a non-Chalcedonian hierarchy. As already acknowledged by several scholars the shift from claiming legitimacy to establishing a

[8] It was not before 534/5 that Severus—before going to Constantinople—presumably said: 'Since it is everyone's will lo! I will go up, but it is impossible that anything whatever will be done by those who are in power.' John of Ephesus put these words into Severus' mouth, and even in 534/5 it was unlikely that Severus really said this. It would make no sense of why Severus went to Constantinople nevertheless. It can be understood, however, as a historicized prophecy as John recorded these words after Justinian's death in 565; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 18, 687.

counter-hierarchy was an important and definite step towards the making of the Syrian Orthodox Church.[9]

The ordination of a counter-hierarchy could facilitate accusations against the non-Chalcedonian bishops of acting against church law as they not only had left their sees but then also intruded the jurisdiction of an established (Chalcedonian) church hierarchy. The non-Chalcedonian bishops nevertheless decided to take this step pretty soon after the Chalcedonians had expelled them. Shortly after the last non-Chalcedonian bishop left his see, John of Tella ordained the first new non-Chalcedonian clergy.[10] The development from a brief hesitation to establish their own hierarchy to the mass ordinations conducted by John of Tella will be outlined here.

As de Lubac reminds his readers, priesthood was not an end in itself. The sacramental life of the church required a priesthood, but this became necessary only if there were believers who were in need of non-Chalcedonian sacraments. It is therefore also necessary to discuss the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, and the role of the laity and the liturgy, in as much as this is possible from the surviving evidence.

NON-CHALCEDONIAN NETWORKS

After the Council of Chalcedon the opponents of the council started to build a non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical hierarchy. In exceptional cases they ordained bishops for bishoprics which already had a Chalcedonian bishop, as they did in Jerusalem where they ordained almost immediately after the council the non-Chalcedonian

[9] W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972; *idem*, 'Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy', in *The Heritage of the Early Church*, ed. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, OCA 195, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1973, 261–75; *idem*, 'The Monophysites and the Transition between the Ancient World and the Middle Ages', in *Passagio dal Mondo Antico al Medio Evo da Teodosio a San Gregorio Magno*, Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1980, 339–65; A. Vööbus, 'The Origin of the Monophysite Church in Syria and Mesopotamia', *ChH* 42 (1973), 17–26.

[10] See V. Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*: John of Tella, his Eucharistic Ecclesiology and the Establishment of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in Exile', *OrChr* 90 (2006), 49f.

Theodosius against the Chalcedonian patriarch Juvenal.[11] However, the military quickly crushed the Palestinian insurrection of mainly non-Chalcedonian monks, and reinstated Juvenal of Jerusalem. From then onwards until 518, it became a race for both sides to fill vacant bishoprics with bishops of their respective Christological persuasion rather than setting 'altar against altar'.[12]

Although short-lived, the Palestinian insurrection (451–3) remains important as it marked the beginning of a post-Chalcedonian hierarchy of non-Chalcedonian persuasion. One of the first non-Chalcedonian bishops was Peter the Iberian, a famous holy man and bishop of Maiuma (452/3).[13] Peter ordained the non-Chalcedonian Timothy Aelurus patriarch of Alexandria in 457, whom his trusted deacon Peter Mongus followed in office.[14] Peter the Iberian also became the spiritual father of Severus of Antioch and founded a monastery in Palestine which educated non-Chalcedonian monks like Severus.[15] John Rufus, a disciple of Peter and later possibly also bishop of Maiuma, wrote a life of his master and collected sayings and visions for his *Plerophoriae.* Another *Vita* and a church history come from the hand of Zachariah Rhetor, bishop of Mitylene, who was a friend of Severus from the time when they studied together in Alexandria.[16] The fierce non-Chalcedonian metropolitan of Mabbug, Philoxenus, promoted Severus to the see of Antioch, and was also one of the bishops who ordained Severus in 512. The majority of Philoxenus' suffragan bishops accompanied Philoxenus in the task of ordaining Severus.[17] Philoxenus, who had

[11] E. Honigmann, 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5 (1950), 208–79.

[12] Frend, 'Severus of Antioch', 263f.

[13] [John Rufus], *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des Fünften Jahrhunderts*, ed. and trans. Richard Raabe, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1895; see also Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine.*

[14] Haas, 'Patriarch and People', 303.

[15] Severus, *Select Letters* V.11 and V.12, Brooks, 367–85 (325–42), where he referred to Peter; for the monastery see Chapter 3.

[16] Zachariah Rhetor, *Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique*, ed. and trans. M.-A. Kugener, in *PO* 2, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 3–115; see W. Bauer, 'Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor', in *idem, Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1967, 210–28; and E. Watts, 'Winning the Intracommunal Dialogues: Zacharias Scholasticus' *Life of Severus*', *JECS* 13 (2005), 437–64. J.-E. Steppa, 'Anti-Chalcedonianism, Hellenic Religion and Heresy in Zacharias Scholasticus' *Life of Severus*', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 249–53.

[17] For the ordination see 'Allocution prononcée par Sévère', Kugener, 270f.

reigned as metropolitan in Mabbug since 485, had probably ordained them all. On the other hand the non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Peter the Fuller, had ordained Philoxenus and probably the non-Chalcedonian Cyrus of Edessa as well, fifteen years earlier in 470, another metropolitan whom Hormisdas had condemned in his letter to the monks and archimandrites of Syria II.[18] Cyrus probably established a line of non-Chalcedonian metropolitans in Edessa which ended with Paul of Edessa. Paul must have also ordained the famous saint of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Jacob of Sarug, as bishop of Batnae in 519. Although this is a sketchy picture which leaves much to be desired—especially concerning the lesser-known bishoprics—it is obvious that the non-Chalcedonians developed a power network of non-Chalcedonian sees in the East before 518.

In the years following the accession of Justin I, the non-Chalcedonian bishops needed to regroup their network in exile.[19] The non-Chalcedonians everywhere regarded Severus as their true patriarch, even after he had left Antioch for Egypt. The fact that Severus wrote so many letters and that a good number of them still exist did not happen by chance. The non-Chalcedonian bishops probably referred matters concerning church life in most cases to their patriarch and expected his response.[20] These could include rather detailed problems ranging from salaries for priests who had become too old to perform the sacerdotal ministry to more important issues like the reception of Chalcedonian priests who turned to the non-Chalcedonians.[21] His decisions concerning ecclesiastical order became the model for at least one of the non-Chalcedonian canons

[18] For the ordination of Philoxenus by Peter the Fuller see: J. Lebon, 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', *Muséon* 43 (1930), 206f. (217); for Cyrus: *Chronicle of Edessa*, 71, Hallier, 152 (116).

[19] Two very good network studies for the late antique and Byzantine world are E. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1992, 11–42, and M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, Aldershot: Variorum Ashgate 1997 (in particular chapter 4, 'Collection and Network (II)'). The purpose of the subchapter here is far less ambitious than—especially—Margaret Mullett's study—and less sophisticated, partly due to the lack of letters by recipients of Severus' letters.

[20] And, of course, vice versa, Severus expected them to inform him of any matter of importance.

[21] Severus, *Select Letters* I.57, Brooks, 190f. (172) and Thomas of Germanicia, *Letter to the Archimandrite John of Mar Eusebius*, BL Add. 14532, fol. 142b.

from this period.[22] When invited to the debate of 532/3 in Constantinople, the non-Chalcedonian bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch wrote to Severus and probably received instructions how to conduct the debate.[23] The bishops were unable in the debate to make any decision without the patriarch—or at least claimed this as an excuse in order that Justinian could not force them to accept his conditions.[24]

On the other hand, the non-Chalcedonian bishops needed to be independent enough to make some decisions on their own. Communications became difficult with a patriarch who hid in exile. The exiled non-Chalcedonian bishops formed clusters in Egypt, Constantinople, and Marde, as will be analysed below.[25]

Severus was grateful for the support which the exiled non-Chalcedonians received from the non-Chalcedonians in Egypt. He regarded the non-Chalcedonians in the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria as united against the Chalcedonians and in communion with each other.[26] Nevertheless, he differentiated between the 'persecuted church of the East' and the 'Egyptian Church'. Some of the exiled non-Chalcedonian clergy who came to Egypt went further as Severus sadly remarked: 'One might hear them relating certain dreams and prophecies, on account of which, as they say, they hesitated to communicate with the holy churches in Egypt.'[27] One might wish to know more about the tensions between the non-Chalcedonians from Asia

[22] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 25, in *The Synodicon*, Vööbus, 169f. (trans. 162f.). The text was edited and translated into Latin from another manuscript already by I. Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. iii: *Documenta Liturgica*, Sharfeh: Typis Patriarchalibus 1908; a French translation was prepared by F. Nau, 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', *ROC* 14 (1909), 1–49 and 113–30. See also Constantine of Laodicea and Antoninus of Aleppo *Letter to Thomas of Germanicia*, BL Add. 14532, fol. 145b.

[23] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.16, Brooks, 127 (Brooks, 87; Hamilton and Brooks, 257).

[24] S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981) 110.

[25] The exact dates when the bishops were at these locations are not entirely clear; see below.

[26] As seen in Chapter 2, Severus' stay in Egypt was remembered, and he later became a saint in the Coptic Church; see Leslie S. B. MacCoull, '"A dwelling Place of Christ, a Healing Place of Knowledge": The Non-Chalcedonian Eucharist in Late Antique Egypt and its Setting', in *Varieties of Devotion in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. S. Karaut-Nunn, Turnhout: Brepols 2002, 1–16.

[27] Severus, *Select Letters* V.11, Brooks, 369f. (327f.).

Minor and Syria and the non-Chalcedonians from Egypt, and why the exiled did not want to receive communion with the locals. Some of the exiled non-Chalcedonians might have encountered ritual or sacramental differences between their tradition, and the habits of the local Egyptians whose offspring established the Coptic Church.[28]

For the moment, however, quarrels among the exiled bishops themselves preoccupied Severus. Julian of Halicarnassus, who had supported Severus in his accusations against Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople (496–511), had chosen exile in Egypt as well.[29] Here, however, sometime after 520, it became obvious that Julian's understanding of the incorruptibility of Christ and Severus' Christology were not compatible. In the wake of this controversy between Julian and Severus, Julian gained many followers throughout Egypt and his doctrine also spread to the patriarchate of Antioch. The monks of the monastery of Isaac in Gabbula in Syria I—expelled in 525—became Julianists.[30] Julianists came to Egypt to receive ordinations from (Severian) non-Chalcedonian bishops and returned to the East.[31] These priests apparently gained some ground in the East and, in fact, Julianists even reached the Persian border and beyond.[32] Severus was concerned about the dissemination of what, in his eyes, was a heresy spread all over the East, and asked the non-Chalcedonian bishops who hid around Marde to warn the monks in Mesopotamia about this heresy.[33]

[28] As Severus noted, the forms of hymns and odes differed between Syrians, Palestinians, and Phoenicians and Egyptians; see Severus, *A Collection of Letters* 54, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, in *PO* 12, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1915, 332.

[29] C. Kannengiesser and M. Stein, 'Iulianos VI', *RAC* 19 (2001), 505–8.

[30] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 81 (Brooks, 56; Hamilton and Brooks, 211).

[31] They probably wanted to receive a Severian non-Chalcedonian ordination in order to be accepted by Severian non-Chalcedonians in the East; *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 33, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 174 (166).

[32] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 21, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 167f. (161): they baptized people; in other words, some priests must have established themselves in villages. *From a Letter which one of the venerable Bishops wrote to his Friend*, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 182 (173), mentions a 'Julianist of the party of Ishaq': if this Ishaq is the name of a place it might be Beth Ishaq; see A. Palmer, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur 'Abdin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990, xxi (map). A Julianist monk in Persia betrayed John of Tella to the authorities: Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 67 (Ghanem, 77).

[33] Severus, *Select Letters* V.14f., Brooks, 389–405 (345–59).

Scholars presumed that a majority of exiled bishops left for Egypt, which the Chalcedonians left undisturbed in its non-Chalcedonian persuasion until 536/7. However, it is not clear where the majority of non-Chalcedonian bishops went, and it seems that a good number of bishops stayed in the patriarchate of Antioch. Marde in Mesopotamia I remained a safe location for non-Chalcedonians when John of Tella, Thomas of Dara, and Philoxenus of Doliche lived there before 525.[34] Also Sergius of Cyrrhus, Marion of Sura, and Nonnus of Circesium must have been somewhere close by.[35] These bishops together composed a letter to the monks warning them of the Julianist heresy, as requested by Severus.[36] Elias, the author of the *Life of John of Tella*, records that John of Tella warned everyone 'by writing everywhere continually, warning, advising, and teaching from the Holy Scriptures and from the teachings of the spiritual Fathers'.[37] This is corroborated by John of Tella's *Canons* in which he requested all clergy to keep away from the teachings of Julian of Halicarnassus.[38]

In addition to the above-mentioned six non-Chalcedonian bishops, Thomas of Germanicia and Peter of Reshaina also seem to have been somewhere in the patriarchate of Antioch. The head of the anti-Julianist letter does not mention them among the authors, but they subscribed to the letter, which indicates that they must have subscribed it some time after the other bishops had written the letter, but before they sent it to the monks in Mesopotamia.[39]

[34] Severus, *Select Letters* V.14, Brooks, 389–94 (345–50), is a letter to John and Philoxenus and Thomas the bishops, confessors on the hill of Marde. From Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60 (Ghanem, 71), it is likely that this Thomas is Thomas of Dara.

[35] Severus, *Select Letters* V. 15, Brooks, 394–405 (350–9); Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60 (Ghanem, 71).

[36] R. Draguet, 'Une pastorale antijulianiste des environs de l'année 530', *Muséon* 40 (1927), 75–92 together with A. Vööbus, 'Entdeckung neuer Handschriften des antijulianischen Pastoralschreibens', *OrChr* 66 (1982), 114–17, who identifies the subscribing non-Chalcedonian bishops. It is surprising that both seem not to know the partial edition and translation of the letter by I. Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. i, Sharfeh: Typis Patriarchalibus 1904, 24f. (the names slightly vary; see below); also Kannengiesser and Stein, 'Iulianos VI', do not mention Rahmani's work.

[37] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 62 (Ghanem, 72f.).

[38] John of Tella *Canons* 1, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 146f. (143f.). The text in the *Synodicon* calls John of Tella John bar Qursos, bishop of Tella d-Mauzelat, but they are the same person; see Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 46f.

[39] *Studia Syriaca*, Rahmani, vol. i, 24f.; see also Vööbus, 'Entdeckung neuer Handschriften des antijulianischen Pastoralschreibens'. As Philoxenus of Doliche was also

This cluster of non-Chalcedonian bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch also formed the delegation that went to Constantinople for the debates in 532/3.[40] There is no indication that non-Chalcedonian bishops were already in Constantinople before 532/3. Some monks might have arrived there earlier, but probably also not before 530/1.[41] Probably not before 535/6 did Justinian's wife Theodora organize a so-called refugee camp in the palace of Hormisdas in which also the debates of 532/3 had taken place.[42] After 532/3 John of Tella returned to the East to ordain more priests, and according to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor also the other non-Chalcedonian bishops who participated in the debate of 532/3 returned.[43] However, some of the monks and priests may have stayed, as it seems that the non-Chalcedonians launched into religious activities in Constantinople. The presence of non-Chalcedonian clergy might have caused the anti-Chalcedonian demonstration after the earthquake in November 533.[44] Zooras, who 'had been some time in the royal city' in 535/6, baptized well-to-do Constantinopolitans, and also Peter of Apamea

only among the subscribers, but not among the authors as well, it might be the case that he had already left Marde earlier, and Severus, who had sent a letter to John, Thomas, and Philoxenus in Marde, just did not know yet about Philoxenus' whereabouts.

[40] It is not entirely clear who took part in the debates as the sources give different combinations of bishops for the non-Chalcedonian delegation, but they all belonged to the cluster of bishops that subscribed to the anti-Julianist letter; see Brock, 'The Conversations', 117f.

[41] 530/1 is the date when the Amidene and Edessene monks were allowed to return to their monasteries (see Chapter 3), and perhaps some moved to the capital. It is not entirely clear when Jacob Baradaeus (see Chapter 5 and general Conclusion) arrived in Constantinople. According to John of Ephesus he became bishop around 542 and had lived in Constantinople for fifteen years. But the spurious *Vita* of Jacob narrates that he came for a conference in matters of faith to Constantinople (John's *Life* of Jacob and Theodore only knew that Jacob had come for matters of faith to the royal city), i.e. very likely for the conference in 532/3. Jacob nevertheless might have been one of the first non-Chalcedonian ascetics who came to Constantinople as the spurious *Life* knows that he was there before 'the dense crowds of believers came to the royal city'; see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 49, 50 and Appendix, in *PO* 18, 691f.; *PO* 19, 153 and 236f.

[42] See John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 18, 676–84.

[43] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60 (Ghanem, 70). Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* XI.15, Brooks, 123 (Brooks, 84; Hamilton and Brooks, 253). From the non-Chalcedonian bishops who participated in the debate probably only Philoxenus of Doliche stayed, as he defected from the non-Chalcedonian faith.

[44] See Chapter 1 and below.

arrived at some point in Constantinople.[45] Probably in 535/6 the non-Chalcedonians established a permanent episcopal presence in and around Constantinople which then became an important centre for non-Chalcedonian bishops.[46]

Around this time, 532–4, the non-Chalcedonian bishops from the patriarchate of Antioch wrote a long letter in which they issued administrative canons concerning church life.[47] These forty-two canons rule on questions concerning baptism, reception of heretics, ordinations, and consecration of churches as well as anointing of altars, etc. These bishops might have also sent a letter to the presbyters and archimandrites Paul and Paul in the village Lisos/Nisos in Cilicia—again concerning church life.[48] The non-Chalcedonian bishops obviously took their pastoral care seriously, but the best they could often do was sending letters in which they decided about sacraments, matters of administration, or church life for non-Chalcedonian communities at home.[49]

[45] For Zooras see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 2, in *PO* 17, 26.

[46] 'Permanent' is not meant in the sense that the non-Chalcedonians had one permanent episcopal liaison at court. Anthimus became patriarch in 535 and turned non-Chalcedonian. He stayed in Constantinople protected by Theodora even after his deposition in 536. Furthermore at least Peter of Apamea was in Constantinople (probably until 536), Severus (for a short while in 535/6), Theodosius of Alexandria (confined in Thrace until his death in 566), John of Hephaestu (536–42?), and then John of Ephesus. As they were not confined like Anthimus and Theodosius, the two Johns left Constantinople for various purposes and destinations, but returned later. See Chapter 5 and general Conclusion.

[47] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient*, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 163–76 (157–68). The text was edited and translated into Latin from another manuscript already by I. Rahmani, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. iii: *Documenta Liturgica*, Sharfeh: Typis Patriarchalibus 1908; a French translation was prepared by F. Nau, 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', *ROC* 14 (1909), 1–49 and 113–30. See below. Although the authors are only called 'holy fathers', from the content it is evident that they were bishops. From the location ('Orient' or 'East') no other bishops can be meant than the above-mentioned. For the date see also A. Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde*, vol. i, CSCO 307, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1970, 167–75.

[48] *From a Letter Written by the Holy Fathers to the Presbyters and Rishai Dairata Paul and Paul*, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 176–8 (168–70), but see also Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen*, vol. i, 164–7.

[49] For an introduction to pastoral care in late antiquity (taking the examples of John Chrysostom and Severus of Antioch) see P. Allen and W. Meyer, 'Through a Bishop's Eyes: Towards a Definition of Pastoral Care in Late Antiquity', *Aug.* 40 (2000), 345–97, especially for administration as part of pastoral care, 373–7, 380f.,

Ecclesiastical canons, in the form of questions and answers, written by the exiled non-Chalcedonian bishops Constantine of Laodicea, Antoninus of Aleppo, Thomas of Damascus (or Yabrud), Pelagius of Kalenderis, and Eustathius of Pherre in Alexandria in 535, illuminate that the non-Chalcedonians who had fled to Egypt did the same.[50] They ruled how the clergy, monks, and laity should conduct themselves at martyr shrines, how heretics should be received, and so on. These five bishops wrote these canons independently from Severus, although the patriarch of Antioch was still alive. They seem to have formed the only cluster of non-Chalcedonian bishops in Egypt, although it is entirely possible that more non-Chalcedonian bishops remained hidden somewhere around Alexandria.[51]

From all non-Chalcedonian bishops, Severus' administrative work remains best known because so many of his letters have survived.[52] The Australian scholars Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer argue that 'the amount of networking done by Severus in exile with other exiled bishops [...] demonstrates how closely the question of the administration of the non-Chalcedonian church in exile was connected with promoting its cause and providing spiritual guidance by letter'.[53]

and 387–9. For an introduction to the legal sources of the Syrian Orthodox Church see W. Selb, *Orientalisches Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii: *Die Geschichte des Kirchenrechts der Westsyrer (von den Anfängen bis zur Mongolenzeit)*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1989.

[50] *Ecclesiastical Canons which were Given by the Holy Fathers during the Time of Persecution* 3 and 4, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 160–2 (155f.). The text does not mention the sees of the bishops, but with the exception of Thomas the bishoprics are clear. There are, however, four non-Chalcedonian bishops called Thomas: Thomas of Dara, of Germanicia, of Damascus, and of Yabrud. The first two seemed to have stayed in the patriarchate of Antioch and have never been in exile in Egypt (for them see below). Therefore one of the last two must have co-authored this letter.

[51] As Severus said that he was hiding in Egypt and afraid of being caught be the Chalcedonians, it is obvious why no cluster of non-Chalcedonian bishops formed itself around their patriarch.

[52] Although only less than one-fifteenth of the presumed total number of letters (300 out of 3,759); see P. Allen, 'The Syrian Church through Bishops' Eyes: The Letters of Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Severus of Antioch', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 3–21, here especially 5f. and 7f.; for Severus' pastoral care see also P. Allen, 'Severus of Antioch and Pastoral Care', in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, vol. ii, ed. P. Allen, W. Mayer, and L. Cross, Everton Park: Centre for Early Christian Studies 1999, 387–400 and *eadem*, 'Severus of Antioch as Pastoral Carer', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 353–68.

[53] Allen and Mayer, 'Through a Bishop's Eyes', 391.

Severus had trusted messengers who were independent enough to redirect his pastoral letters to other bishops if they considered a redirection necessary and in Severus' interest.[54]

This system of networks and clusters seems to have worked quite well for a while. The scarce evidence suggests that the non-Chalcedonian bishops stayed in regular contact with each other.[55] Thomas of Germanicia mentions a letter he wrote to Severus, a letter to John of Tella, and a letter John wrote to Thomas.[56] Constantine of Laodicea and Antoninus of Aleppo wrote to Thomas of Germanicia discussing questions of ordinations.[57] Severus wrote a letter to Thomas of Dara, Philoxenus of Doliche, and John of Tella, and another to Sergius of Cyrrhus and Marion of Sura and expected their replies.[58] Severus delegated administrative work to his bishops or other clergy in the East, and thereby still oversaw the non-Chalcedonian churches in his former patriarchate.

However, the non-Chalcedonian bishops had not planned on establishing this system for the long run. Since the Chalcedonians had exiled all non-Chalcedonian bishops, most administrative decisions concerning church life—sacraments, ordinations, reception of former heretics, consecration of altars and churches, etc.—could not be decided locally, but needed confirmation by a bishop who may have been hundreds of miles away. Weather conditions or the winter season could delay an answer by months.[59] It was logistically impossible for bishops in exile to answer all questions of clergy, monks, or lay communities which in normal times required a good education on

[54] Severus, *Select Letters* V.15, Brooks, 395 (351f.). It shows the public character of these letters although sometimes Severus explicitly asked that the letter should not be seen by anyone except the addressee. Obviously, the fact that scholars today have these letters proves that even rather personal letters bore enough interest for the non-Chalcedonians to collect and preserve them.

[55] It is, however, impossible to say how often they wrote to each other or even whether the bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch wrote to each other more regularly than they did with the bishops in Egypt.

[56] Thomas of Germanicia, *Letter to the Archimandrite John of Mar Eusebius*, BL Add. 14532, fol. 142b.

[57] Constantine of Laodicea and Antoninus of Aleppo, *Letter to Thomas of Germanicia*, BL Add. 14532, fols. 145a–145b. For the question of ordinations see below.

[58] Severus, *Select Letters* V.14 and V.15, Brooks, 389–405 (345–59). For the contact between the patriarch and the other bishops see below.

[59] Severus, *Select Letters* V.11 and V.15, Brooks, 369 and 403 (327 and 357).

the part of the local priests and sufficient supervision by their bishops. The most urgent concern which demanded local non-Chalcedonian clergy was the church sacraments, especially the Eucharist.

THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN EUCHARIST

The non-Chalcedonians tried to avoid a Chalcedonian baptism for their children, but rebaptism was not an option and therefore they accepted Chalcedonian baptism as valid.[60] More problematic was the Eucharist, which had not only a spiritual but also an economic component. Some pious and well-to-do non-Chalcedonians had to be reminded of the canonical procedure, as they wished to receive the Eucharist directly from the patriarch Severus, who had established already in his lifetime the aura of a holy man. Severus replied to their 'mail-order' requests that they should instead take the Eucharist from their local non-Chalcedonian priests as it would make no difference who gave the sacrament to them.[61] Severus argued that 'those persons to whom it is necessary to send it [the Eucharist] are those who are wholly deprived of divine communion'.[62] While in exile, Severus wrote a letter to Caesaria, an aristocratic non-Chalcedonian woman possibly of royal descent:[63]

On the question of a person being compelled, in times of persecution when no priest or ministrant is present, to take communion with his own hand, it is superfluous to point out that this is in no wise sinful, since long custom

[60] But cf. F. Nau, 'La lettre de Philoxène de Mabboug à 'Abou-Niphir', *ROC* 8 (1903), 629.

[61] K. Bowes, 'Personal Devotions and Private Chapels', in *Late Antique Christianity*, ed. V. Burrus, Minneapolis: Fortress Press 2005, 194f.; V. Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', *Hugoye* 7.2 (2004) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol7No2/HV7N2Menze.html], par. 14. It is not clear why Allen and Mayer, 'Through a Bishop's Eyes', 381, call the Eucharist in general here 'Viaticum', which was only the case with Caesaria's request (Severus, *Select Letters* III.4, Brooks, 277–82 (244–9)). Severus, *Select Letters* III.2 and III.3, Brooks, 262–77 (233–44).

[62] Severus, *Select Letters* III.2, Brooks, 264 (234).

[63] She is the recipient of a number of Severus' letters, several of which concern the Eucharist; see also John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 54, in *PO* 19, 185–91, 197 and *PLRE* 2, 248f.

has sanctioned this practice from the very force of circumstances. For all who live the monastic life in the solitudes, where there is no priest, keep their communion at home and partake of it from their own hands.[64]

Severus corresponded with Caesaria in several letters on problems concerning the Eucharist and answered all her enquiries patiently. However, the case of an aristocratic lay person like Caesaria, who was very keen to converse with a venerated man like Severus and to demonstrate her personal devotion, can hardly be representative. John of Ephesus considered her life worth recording for good reason.[65] The norm seems to have been rather a laity that needed to be reminded that the Eucharist was profitable. Rural villages often lacked a priest and did not care to change this situation. In their belief system baptism was essential to become Christian, but as one villager queried, 'For what [purpose] is the oblation?'[66] Others did not distinguish between the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian Eucharist. The case of Amida shows that non-Chalcedonians sat next to Chalcedonians when Abraham bar Kayli celebrated mass.[67]

Even if not all lay persons cared to distinguish between the non-Chalcedonian and the Chalcedonian sacrament, the non-Chalcedonian bishops took the matter of the Eucharist very seriously. Philoxenus wondered how the Chalcedonians could celebrate the Eucharist if they would not believe that Christ as God died on the Cross.[68] For their own Eucharist, the non-Chalcedonian bishops were very concerned about its purity and its canonical administration. In the 520s John of Tella meticulously explained to a deacon how he should prepare the 'awe-inspiring mysteries'.[69] In his *Questions and Answers*, John patiently

[64] Saint Basil, *The Letters* 93, ed. and trans. R. J. Deferrari, LCL 215, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1928, 144–7. S. J. Voicu, 'Cesaria, Basilio (*EP. 93/94*) e Severo', *Aug.* 35 (1995), 697–703, proves that Severus of Antioch wrote this letter, and not Basil; for auto-communion see B. Caseau, 'L'abandon de la communion dans la main (IVe–XIIe s.)', in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, Travaux et Mémoires 14, Paris 2002, 91f.

[65] For Caesaria and her library see Chapter 3.

[66] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 16, in *PO* 17, 233; see Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', par. 5.

[67] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 101–3. See Chapters 3 and 5.

[68] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moins de Senoun*, ed. and trans. A. de Halleux, CSCO 231/2, Leuven: Peeters 1963, 30f. (25).

[69] Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 54–60.

instructed a priest how he could avoid a defilement of sanctuary and Eucharist.[70]

Non-Chalcedonian hagiographies like John Rufus' *Plerophoriae*, compiled when Severus was patriarch in Antioch (512–18), demonstrated to the average non-Chalcedonian how he should deal with the Eucharist. It was better for a non-Chalcedonian to receive a non-Chalcedonian Eucharist only once a year than regularly a Chalcedonian Eucharist from a Chalcedonian priest. [71] The true believer who stayed away from the Chalcedonian service received communion from heaven itself. The Chalcedonian John Moschus records the story of a non-Chalcedonian who caught his wife taking the Chalcedonian Eucharist, 'grabbed her by the throat and forced her to emit the [according to the Chalcedonian author:] holy portion'.[72] For the non-Chalcedonian husband salvation was only possible through communion and community with the non-Chalcedonians.[73] In the *Life of Peter the Iberian* from the end of the fifth century, eucharistic miracles, in which blood burst forth from the Eucharist and Christ appeared next to the celebrant, provided proof to the non-Chalcedonian that God was on their side.[74] If non-Chalcedonians were slaughtered for their conviction, Christ appeared, brought them to the altar, and gave 'them of my body and blood before I take them to heaven with me'.[75]

[70] John of Tella, *Questions and Answers*, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 211–21 (197–205).

[71] John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 38 (ed. and trans. *Plérophories*, F. Nau, in *PO* 8, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1912, 89); Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma', 228.

[72] John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, 30, in *PG* 87, 2877 (John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. J. Wortley, CS 139, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1992, 22f.).

[73] The Chalcedonians of course also claimed to offer salvation through their Eucharist. Some naive fellows who were not used to shopping for salvation were profoundly confused as John Moschus points out neatly through the mouth of a—according to the author—'Nestorian' monk: '"But truly, abba, all the sects speak like that sir: that if you are not in communion with us, you are not being saved;"' John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* 26, in *PG* 87, 2872 (Wortley, 18).

[74] [John Rufus], *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des Fünften Jahrhunderts*, ed. and trans. R. Raabe, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1895, 56 (57). See V. Déroche, 'Représentations de l'eucharistie dans la haute époque Byzantine', in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, Travaux et Mémoires 14, Paris 2002, 167–80, and Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist', pars. 1f.

[75] *A Panegyric on Macarius, Bishop of Tkôw attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria*, ed. and trans. D. W. Johnson, CSCO 415, 416, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1980, 53 (41). This legendary life survives in Coptic, but might have been originally

Outside hagiography non-Chalcedonians hardly ever died for their conviction. The only recorded instance is the case of the priest Cyrus, whom Abraham bar Kayli burned because Cyrus spat out the Chalcedonian Eucharist when it was forced into his mouth.[76] Although exceptional it is noteworthy that a non-Chalcedonian priest preferred death to communion with the Chalcedonians. This conduct can only be understood if taking the wrong Eucharist was regarded as equal to apostasy.

Non-Chalcedonian bishops pointed out drastically the implications the different Eucharists had for their followers: according to John Rufus, the non-Chalcedonian Eucharist could transform itself into the true body and blood of Christ, [77] whereas according to John of Tella the Chalcedonian Eucharist was a dangerous and magic portion that needed to be avoided at all costs. John even regarded it as necessary to flee from the Chalcedonian Eucharist as from 'a poison of death'.[78]

Eucharistic bread as well as other types of bread was baked with the help of bread stamps, which could identify it for example as Christian or pagan. Christian martyrs therefore refused to eat bread that was stamped by a pagan state official as they would consider it as dangerous and magic, and eating it as being disloyal to their persuasion.[79] Similarly it seems likely that non-Chalcedonian Christians needed to avoid Chalcedonian Eucharistic bread stamped by a Chalcedonian bishop as a magic and dangerous portion.[80]

written in Greek in the sixth century (post-518); see also L. Perrone, 'Christian Holy Places and Pilgrimage in an Age of Dogmatic Conflicts: Popular Religion and Confessional Affiliation in Byzantine Palestine (Fifth to Seventh Centuries)', *POC* 48 (1998), 5–37.

[76] *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 34–6 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 1999, 62f.); see Chapter 5.

[77] For true body and blood of Christ see John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 10, Nau, 24. See Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma', 230.

[78] John of Tella, *Questions and Answers* 44, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 220 (trans. 204f.).

[79] F. J. Dölger, 'Heidnische und christliche Brotstempel mit religiösen Zeichen', *AuC* 1 (1929), 1–46 (especially 16f.) with plates 1–10.

[80] Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 73f.

Severus' letters amply illuminate the necessity of avoiding communion with the Chalcedonians. John Rufus recorded a story about a monk from southern Palestine who—after his miraculous return from the dead—informed his fellow monks that he found mercy and was not tortured in hell not because of his pious and ascetic way of life but only because he kept his non-Chalcedonian persuasion and stayed away from communion with the Chalcedonians.[81] Non-Chalcedonians had to abstain from almost all contacts with the Chalcedonians—including kissing Chalcedonians on their mouth as John of Tella ruled in his *Questions and Answers*![82] This might be the 'kiss of peace' referring back to Paul: 'Greet one another with a holy kiss.'[83] John Chrysostom, former patriarch of Constantinople (398–404), explained that the mouth of a Christian who ate the body of Christ in form of the Eucharist is worthy to be kissed.[84] The kiss of peace was part of the liturgy, and was only exchanged between Christians who were in communion. They took the Eucharist together after they forgave their fellow believers by kissing them.[85] Therefore John of Tella allowed non-Chalcedonians a usual greeting with a Chalcedonian, but not a kiss of peace as this was a visible sign of being in communion even before taking the Eucharist.

The Chalcedonians noticed the cosmological boundary that non-Chalcedonian bishops raised for their flock. Cometas, a soldier of some rank, caught a non-Chalcedonian deacon in Harran and 'forced him to receive the [Chalcedonian] Eucharist or to pay so many darics'.[86] Although the non-Chalcedonian hagiographer Elias recorded this in order to demonstrate the wickedness of Cometas, it seems obvious that Cometas was not a Chalcedonian zealot. In fact, he 'said a blasphemy which is not easy to write down', and seems to have abused the non-Chalcedonian fear for the wrong Eucharist. If 'daric' is a gold coin the deacon could not

[81] John Rufus, *Plerophoriae* 87, Nau, 140f.

[82] John of Tella, *Questions and Answers* 25, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 216 (trans. 201).

[83] 2 Corinthians 13:12; see also 1 Corinthians 16:20.

[84] F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiochia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1970, 223f.

[85] P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England 2001, 96.

[86] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 87 (Ghanem, 100).

have paid this money nor could Cometas have expected him to do so. If Elias exaggerated the amount, Cometas might have indeed tried to make some money by threatening the deacon. Otherwise he probably just played a cruel joke on the poor cleric.

Be this as it may, the story demonstrates the care of pious Christians for orthopraxis and their belief in the Eucharist as substance that contains supra-natural power—either demonic or divine. However, the soldier's pragmatic and very secular approach to it might be more representative for a wider part of the lay population who did not give any metaphysical connotation to the Eucharist or even the sacraments in general.

As non-Chalcedonian bishops saw a real threat for their non-Chalcedonian communities to take the wrong Eucharist, the question arises where non-Chalcedonians faced this danger. The first and most common location remains of course their parish church in case a Chalcedonian priest took over and celebrated mass there.[87] Severus warned non-Chalcedonians when praying at the holy places in Jerusalem—which the Chalcedonians guarded—not to take the Chalcedonian Eucharist.[88] Also martyr shrines potentially provided a place where Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians might receive the Eucharist from a priest of the opposing party. Especially when the sick sought healing from the martyrs, they did not care if the shrine was administered by Chalcedonians or non-Chalcedonians.[89] Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians faced the same problem because not all martyr shrines were in the hand of the Chalcedonians.

Non-Chalcedonian monasteries probably administered some of the (non-Chalcedonian) martyr shrines, and therefore the Chalcedonians had not taken over these shrines.[90] But the martyr shrine of

[87] Or in the cathedral of the new Chalcedonian bishops as seen above in the case of Abraham bar Kayli.

[88] Severus, *Select Letters* IV.7 and IV.9, Brooks, 300f. and 304–6 (266–8 and 270–2). Referring to the period when Severus was patriarch in Antioch (512–18), the (non-Chalcedonian) duke of Palestine was miraculously hindered from entering the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem according to Chalcedonian hagiography: John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* 49, in *PG* 87, 2904f. (Wortley, 39f.).

[89] *From a Letter Written by the Holy Fathers to the Presbyters and Rishai Dairata Paul and Paul* 3, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 177f. (169).

[90] See E. Key Fowden, *The Barbarian Plain: Saint Sergius between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1999, 110, for a martyr shrine of Sergius at the monastery of 'Allmat. The date, however, is unclear.

Beth Shurla in the area of Amida to which the non-Chalcedonians translated the remains of Mara, the former non-Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida, in the 530s might have been a martyr shrine under non-Chalcedonian administration without monastic affiliation.[91] When John of Tella ordained priests, Elias, John's biographer, records that John did this 'for the churches and monasteries'.[92] A letter written by non-Chalcedonian bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch announced how churches and martyr shrines should be consecrated.[93] Therefore it seems that non-Chalcedonian church life existed even outside non-Chalcedonian monasteries in the patriarchate of Antioch.

The fact that the non-Chalcedonian bishops cared so much for their Eucharist might have been due not only to the assumption that wrong communion meant no salvation: there was an economic component to the Eucharist as well. In the early church the laity brought the bread and the offerings, and non-Chalcedonian texts provide hints that it remained the required official practice in this period even if not all the laity fulfilled this duty. John of Tella reminded the non-Chalcedonian priests that they were entitled to receive the tenth from the people.[94] Jacob of Sarug complained that not everyone brought their share of bread and offerings for the memorial of the departed for whom priests also celebrated the Eucharist. His complaint was partly about rich people who let their maidservants bring the offering instead of doing it themselves.[95]

If the laity was in need, they remembered very well to bring the offerings to the priests. Chalcedonians seeking the help of a martyr brought 'with them the tenth or that which is called offerings' even to martyr shrines administered by non-Chalcedonian priests. Thereby they troubled the minds of non-Chalcedonian priests who wished to

[91] See Chapter 3 n. 35 and Chapter 5.

[92] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 58f. (Ghanem, 69).

[93] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 12, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 165f. (159).

[94] John of Tella, *Canons* 14, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 152 (148); see Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist', par. 11.

[95] Jacob of Sarug, 'A Homily of Mâr Jacob of Sérûgh on the Memorial of the Departed and on the Eucharistic Loaf', in *Homiliae Selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis*, vol. i, ed. P. Bedjan, Paris and Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1905, 535–50 (trans. H. Connolly, *DR* 29 (1910), 260–70).

keep the offerings but consulted their bishops about what they should do concerning these Chalcedonian petitioners.[96]

Therefore, through the offerings of the faithful, the Eucharist seems to have had an impact on the economic position of the churches. Unfortunately, the general economic situation of the non-Chalcedonians remains obscure. But as long as the Chalcedonian authorities could not prevent the laity from supporting non-Chalcedonian clergy with their offerings, it was impossible to erase non-Chalcedonianism completely from the patriarchate of Antioch. The non-Chalcedonians kept most of their monasteries—which probably had their own land and probably still benefactors—and administered martyr shrines. Therefore an economic foundation was there on which the non-Chalcedonian bishops could build a church.

LAITY AND LITURGY: THE CASE OF THE TRISAGION

The administration and reception of the Eucharist is embedded in the liturgy, and the discussion of the diptychs demonstrates how important the liturgy was for the faithful in the sixth century. The liturgy defined the relationship of humankind to God, and how close God was to the believer was a crucial question for any late antique Christian.[97] Although Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians alike shared the understanding of Christ having died for their sake, it took them decades to come to a rapprochement of how to express this understanding in the liturgy. The so-called Trisagion and its addition became the focus of the quarrel concerning Christ's divine and human aspects and his soteriological role.[98]

[96] *Ecclesiastical Canons which were Given by the Holy Fathers during the Time of Persecution* 3, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 160f. (155f.).

[97] Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, 107–9.

[98] For the Trisagion see especially J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus*, vol. iii, Rome: Apud Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregorianae 1932, 96–156; see also V.-S. Janeras, 'Les Byzantins et le Trisagion Christologique', in *Miscellanea Liturgica*, vol. ii, Rome: Desclée & C.i Editori Pontifici 1967, 469–99, and E. Klum-Böhmer, *Das Trishagion als Versöhnungsformel der Christenheit*, Munich: Oldenbourg 1979.

In 512 the emperor Anastasius faced one of the greatest challenges of his reign. People rioted in the streets 'because the emperor wanted to add to the Trisagion the phrase they use in the eastern cities, "He who was crucified for us, have mercy on us."'[99] John Malalas explained that the people rioted because 'something alien had been added to the Christian faith', and Evagrius Scholasticus went so far as to say that 'a very great disturbance occurred on the grounds that the Christian worship was being utterly nullified'.[100] What was at stake that the Chalcedonian laity in Constantinople saw their worship as endangered and almost forced the emperor Anastasius to abdicate?

The Trisagion was the acclamation and prayer 'Holy God, holy mighty, holy immortal! Have mercy on us!' It derived from the angels' Sanctus in Isaiah 6:3 and was sung at the beginning of the Eucharistic liturgy.[101] As far as scholars can trace it, the Trisagion had been a fairly recent addition to the liturgy.[102] It is first mentioned in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon (451) and in an interpolated passage in Nestorius' *Bazaar of Heracleides* (*c.* 451–70).[103] The passage in the *Bazaar of Heracleides* claims that the Trisagion was introduced in Constantinople by God's order to make an earthquake stop. A slightly different story can be found in Theophanes Confessor, and is dated to Proclus' tenure as patriarch of Constantinople (434–46).[104] Brian Croke establishes

[99] John Malalas, *Chronicle*, XVI.19, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB 35, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000, 333 (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986, 228).

[100] John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVI.19, Thurn, 333 (E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, 228); Evagrius, *HE* III.44, Bidez and Parmentier, 146 (Whitby, 195).

[101] R. Taft, 'Trisagion', in *ODB*, vol. iii, 1991, 2121. That the Trisagion was probably originally an acclamation and not a declaration see—against Taft and S. Brock, 'The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy', *Sobornost* 7 (1985), 24–34, here 33 n. 17—A. Louth, 'Trishagion', *TRE* 34 (2002), 121–4, especially 121f.

[102] Janeras, 'Les Byzantins et le Trisagion Christologique', 476.

[103] *ACO* II.1.1, 195 (*The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. i, trans. with introduction and notes by R. Price and M. Gaddis, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005, 364).

Nestorius, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, ed. P. Bedjan, Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1910, 500 (English trans. *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1925, 365). The fact that this passage was an interpolation was established by L. Abramowski, *Untersuchungen zum* Liber Heraclidis *des Nestorius*, CSCO 242, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1963, 129–32.

[104] Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 5930, de Boor, 93 (Mango and Scott, 144f.).

438 as the year in which the earthquake took place and in which the Trisagion was handed down by God to the Constantinopolitans according to later belief.[105]

In the acts of the Council of Chalcedon the Trisagion is used—outside the liturgy—as an acclamation by the bishops of the patriarchate of Antioch, which at least shows an early use there if not the place of origin.[106] Severus of Antioch regarded its origins to have been in Antioch, and certainly the non-Chalcedonian addition 'who was crucified for us' originated in Antioch where the non-Chalcedonian patriarch Peter the Fuller introduced it in the 470s. [107] However, later in the sixth century the non-Chalcedonians preferred to assign the introduction of the addition to Eustathius of Antioch (324–7). Thereby they attempted to give the addition more legitimacy since Eustathius was one of the 318 Nicene Fathers and had been persecuted by the non-Nicenes, whereas Peter the Fuller was contested among Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians.[108] Although opposed when introduced into the church of Antioch, the addition remained part of the Trisagion in Antioch and is thereby also part of the liturgy in the Syrian Orthodox Church today.[109]

The Trisagion without the addition comprised two parts, first an acclamation, second a supplication.[110] The addition to the Trisagion connected the acclamation and the supplication by establishing

[105] B. Croke, 'Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration', *Byz.* 51 (1981), 122–47, here 130f.

[106] For the following see Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus*, 110–19.

[107] Severus, *Homily on the Trisagion (Homily 125)*, in *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 120–125*, ed. M. Brière, in *PO* 29, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1960, 232–53. For the addition see Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus*, 119–23.

[108] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VII.7 and 9, Brooks, 40, 49 (Brooks, 27f., 33f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 169, 178). For Eustathius see Athanasius, *History of the Arians* 4 (trans. in *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria*, trans. A. Robertson, NPNF 4, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1953, 271). For other legends concerning the origins of the addition see M. van Esbroeck, 'The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch', *JThS* n.s. 47 (1996), 466.

[109] Today, however, in the form of a declaration: 'Holy are You, O God; Holy are You, O Almighty; Holy are You, O Immortal; You Who were crucified for us, have mercy on us;' *Anaphoras: The Book of the Divine Liturgies according to the Rite of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch*, trans. M. Saliba Barsom and ed. Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, Lodi: Mar A. Y. Samuel 1991, 35–8; see also *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. i: *Eastern Liturgies*, ed. and trans. F. E. Brightman, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1896, 77.

[110] See J. Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine. Étude historique*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1971, 98f.

causality: 'Holy God, holy mighty, holy immortal; who was crucified for us, have mercy on us!' Although God is mighty and immortal, he died for humankind. God is omnipotent, but he knows human suffering. God has not only the power to redeem the believer, but he must save the faithful because he promised it with his death on the cross. He will 'have mercy on us'.

The non-Chalcedonians developed a soteriological formula that attracted believers because it reminded God of his solidarity with humankind. As Peter Brown observed: 'The addition "Who was crucified for us" guaranteed that the Monophysite God was a God intimately connected to the afflicted world.'[111] But the addition did not remain unopposed and even caused riots in the capital that challenged Anastasius' rule.

In Constantinople and in the later Chalcedonian tradition the Trisagion was understood as addressed to all persons of the Trinity: 'Holy God (Father), holy mighty one (Son), holy immortal one (Holy Spirit).'[112] Therefore the addition 'who was crucified for us' would refer to the Godhead, which was not acceptable as only the second person of the Trinity was crucified. Calandio, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (481–5), immediately tried to change Peter's addition and inserted before the addition 'Christ King', thereby softening the Christological meaning and assuring that the addition would refer to Christ only.[113] Although the Chalcedonian church historian Theodore Anagnostes mentioned in the sixth century that Calandio did so because many people were scandalized by the addition, the patriarch obviously did not dare to abandon the addition.[114]

The non-Chalcedonians understood the Trisagion as referring to Christ only. Severus of Antioch refuted the Chalcedonian understanding of the Trisagion as referring to the whole Trinity, but explained in his homily on the Trisagion from 518 that the acclamation—and therefore also the addition—would refer to the Son.[115]

[111] Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, 109.

[112] Taft, 'Trisagion', 2121.

[113] Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Berlin: Akademie 1971, 118; van Esbroeck, 'The Memra on the Parrot', 467.

[114] See A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/3, Freiburg: Herder 2002, 300f.

[115] Severus, *Homily on the Trisagion*, in *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 120–125*, ed. M. Brière, in *PO* 29, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1960, 232–53, for the date 61f.

One of Severus' successors as patriarch of Antioch, the staunch Chalcedonian Ephrem of Amida (526–45), did not find any fault with the Trisagion's addition as long as it was understood as refering to the second person of the Trinity only. He reported that the Trisagion with addition was still sung during his tenure as patriarch.[116] It shows—as well as John Malalas' note above—that the question whether the Trisagion was understood in a Trinitarian or a Christological way had a geographical component as well.[117] Whereas Constantinople and the Byzantine tradition understood it as Trinitarian, the Trisagion found a mainly Christological interpretation in the patriarchate of Antioch. However, as the case of Calandio and the alleged protests in Antioch show, there was some Chalcedonian reservation against the Christological understanding also in the East.[118]

In Constantinople the Christological interpretation did not find any approval. After Severus' death in 538 Justinian accused Severus polemically of having

> dared to say that the trisagion hymn is offered to the Son alone, as though he does not share in the glory of his Father and the Holy Spirit. But this is to separate the Son from the essence of the Father and the Holy Spirit and to suggest either that he is of a different essence, which is simply Arian nonsense, or if not this, then it is the same as denying that Christ is God and One of the Holy Trinity. But this is to offer the hymn to a fourth *prosopon*, which is to fall into the foolish blasphemy of Nestorius. They fail to understand that to separate him from the worship he received together with the Father and the Holy Sprit is to dishonor him, even if they ascribe honor to him as Son.[119]

Justinian did not care to do justice to the non-Chalcedonians when he accused them of Arianism or Nestorianism in this section on the Trisagion in his *Letter to the Alexandrian Monks against the Monophysites*

[116] Photius, *Bibliotheca* 228, 245b; Photius, *Bibliothèque*, vol. iv, ed. and trans. R. Henry, Paris: Les belles Lettres 1965, 115.

[117] See Janeras, 'Les Byzantins et le Trisagion Christologique', 492f.

[118] Brock, 'The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy', 30f.

[119] Justinian, *Letter to the Alexandrian Monks against the Monophysites*, 192, ed. E. Schwartz, *Drei Dogmatische Schriften*, ABAW.PH n.f. 18, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1939, 41 (trans. *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian*, trans. and intro. K. P. Wesche, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1991, 101f.).

(542/3).[120] Nevertheless, his point that the non-Chalcedonians separated the Son from the Trinity needs to be taken seriously. Severus had tried to refute this accusation and claimed that a doxology for the Son was at the same time also a praise for the Father and the Holy Spirit. He remarked in his homily on the Trisagion that 'the glory of the Son is the glory of the Father and the Holy Spirit'.[121] Also John of Tella felt compelled to defend the non-Chalcedonian understanding of the Trisagion as referring to Christ alone. In a commentary on the Trisagion and its non-Chalcedonian addition, written some time between 519 and 538, John assured the believer that 'when the Father is honoured, the Son and the Spirit are honoured with him. And when the Son is rendered holy, the Father and the Spirit are rendered holy with him. Likewise, also when the Spirit is worshipped, the Father and the Son are worshipped with him.'[122] However, both Severus and John of Tella simplified the issue.

The original Sanctus of Isaiah 6:3 was believed to have been sung by the angels to the Lord Sabaoth, and the Church Fathers interpreted the Lord Sabaoth to be the Holy Trinity. In his *Letter to the Alexandrian Monks against the Monophysites*, Justinian brought forth testimony of the Church Fathers and quoted from Athanasius, Gregory the Theologian, Basil, John Chrysostom, and also Cyril of Alexandria, who all understood the angels' Sanctus as referring to the Godhead. Not able to provide proof-texts from the Church Fathers, the non-Chalcedonian historian Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor conveyed that Christ himself answered the Chalcedonians through the mouth of Marinus, a confidant of Anastasius, who was according to Ps.-Zachariah also responsible for the attempt to introduce the addition to the liturgy in Constantinople in 512:

'The angels, indeed, offer the hymn of praise, which contains their confession to the adorable and co-equal Trinity, rightly, and do not proclaim that

[120] For Justinian's Christology and possible dependence on Leontius of Jerusalem see J. L. MacDonald, 'The Christological Works of Justinian', Ph.D. Thesis, Washington, DC 1995; *idem*, 'Leontius of Jerusalem's *Against the Monophysites* as a Possible Source for Justinian's *Letter to the Alexandrian Monks*', *Byz.* 67 (1997), 375–82. For the date of Leontius' work see Chapter 2.

[121] Severus, *Homily on the Trisagion*, Brière, 244f.

[122] John of Tella, 'Il commento al Trisagio di Giovanni Bar Qūrsūs', ed. Vincenzo Poggi and Mar Grigorios (Hanna Ibrahim), *OCP* 52 (1986), 209f.

He was crucified for them; but we, on the other hand, in the hymn of praise, which contains our confession, rightly say that He was crucified for us men, for He became incarnate from us, and did not invest Himself with the nature of angels.'[123]

Christ points out to the believers that he died for them, and therefore the old Sanctus should not be sung like the angels did, but with reference to him who conquered death for humankind. Against the Church Fathers the non-Chalcedonians claimed that this would be the only appropriate way to praise the Son. Not even Severus tried to trace the interpretation of the Trisagion and its addition to early church tradition, but reminded the Chalcedonians that many church customs were invented, and not everything should be hated because it was new.[124]

Although new, the addition to the Trisagion proved to be so powerful that the Chalcedonians could not ignore it. The fact that the immediate successor of Peter the Fuller, the staunch Chalcedonian Calandio, did not dare to remove the addition, but only to insert a 'Christ King' before the addition, speaks for its popularity. The non-Chalcedonians even trained a parrot in Antioch to recite the Trisagion with its addition, and the story of this bird made its way into Syriac literature through a long *memra*.[125] What could the Chalcedonians do?

Non-Chalcedonians and Chalcedonians had a common basis from which probably also Peter the Fuller had developed his interpretation of the Trisagion. The theopaschite formula *Unus ex Trinitate crucifixus* derived from the basic formula *Unus ex Trinitate incarnatus* which was first introduced by Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople (434–46) in his *Tome* to the Armenians. Cyril of Scythopolis' saint Euthymius used the formula 'one of the Trinity became incarnate' against Eutychians as well as Nestorians.[126] Chalcedonians from

[123] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VII.9, Brooks, 49 (Brooks, 34; Hamilton and Brooks, 178).

[124] Severus, *Homily on the Trisagion*, Brière, 246f. Janeras, 'Les Byzantins et le Trisagion Christologique', 476.

[125] Van Esbroeck, 'The Memra on the Parrot', 464–76.

[126] Cyril of Scythopolis, *Life of Euthymius* 26, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1939, 40 (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. R. M. Price, CS 114, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1991, 36f.).

Antioch, Jerusalem, and Syria II sent a letter in favour of this understanding to the court in 520.[127] However, when the formula had spread over the East, various forms of the formula were conceived: Christ was not only understood as 'One of the Trinity incarnate', but also the formula 'One of the Trinity suffered (in flesh)' or, similarly, the formula 'One of the Trinity was crucified' found followers who claimed that already Proclus had introduced this theopaschite formula.[128] It was adopted by both Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians: it appears with variations in the (non-Chalcedonian) *Henoticon*, John Rufus' *Plerophoriae*, Philoxenus of Mabbug's *Dissertationes decem de uno e sancta Trinitate incorporato et passo* and the statement of faith by the emperor Anastasius. Different versions of Proclus' *Tome*, in which now also the theopaschite formula could be found, were disseminated in the East and thereby made the formula acceptable in Chalcedonian circles.[129] In this context stand the Scythian monks who introduced the court to the theopaschite formula in 519.

Philoxenus complained in 522 about those Chalcedonians who deceived the simple believer because they used the formula 'Christ crucified is one of the Trinity.'[130] Employing this formula without denouncing Chalcedon, however, was hypocrisy in Philoxenus' perception. How could these neo-Chalcedonians pretend to say that Christ was crucified if they divided him at the same time? It was

[127] *Coll. Avell.* 232a.

[128] A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989 ['reprint' 2004], 334–6, with other sources and circulation of this formula in Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian circles. Note that p. 334 in the paperback 'reprint' of 2004 is quite different from the original hardback version of 1989.

[129] Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians wrongly credited Proclus for introducing the theopaschite formula; Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus*, 'reprint' edition, 334 (see n. 128). See especially M. Richard, 'Proclus de Constantinople et le Théopaschisme', *RHE* 38 (1942), 303–31. However, some Chalcedonian monks remained opposed to this formula: in 511/12 Chalcedonian monks (the 'Akoimetoi') in Constantinople fabricated letters in which Pope Felix III (483–92) allegedly anathematized Peter the Fuller because of the addition of the Trisagion. See also Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius*, 147–51 and *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*, ed. E. Schwartz, ABAW.PH n.f. 10, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1934, 287–300. For the spread and different renderings and translations of Proclus' *Tome* in eastern traditions see L. van Rompay, 'Proclus of Constantinople's "Tomos ad Armenios" in the Post-Chalcedonian Tradition', in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History*, ed. C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay, Leuven: Peeters 1985, 425–49.

[130] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moins de Senoun*, de Halleux, 76 (62).

not possible, and if not Christ as God was crucified there could be no Eucharist and believers could not be saved.[131]

In Philoxenus' understanding these neo-Chalcedonians from Palestine (including the patriarch of Jerusalem) were despicable, but also more dangerous than the pope in Rome. The papacy in Rome was at least in Philoxenus' eyes openly Nestorian, but the neo-Chalcedonians in Palestine became popular by making compatible the crucified Christ with the Council of Chalcedon. In that respect Paul the Jew, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (519–21), must have come almost as a relief for Philoxenus, who could now easily point out that since the patriarch of Jerusalem was in communion with this outright Nestorian and with Rome, they were all heretics even if some neo-Chalcedonians pretended to believe that God the Word was crucified.[132]

Already Zachariah Rhetor in his *Life of Severus*, probably written 512–18, perceived the potential danger of Chalcedonians deceiving simple believers with the theopaschite formula. Glancing at the quarrels that the introduction of the addition to the Trisagion provoked in Constantinople in 512, he pointed out the great danger that eastern Chalcedonians caused by preparing this hymn for acceptance in Rome.[133] However, as already discussed in Chapter 1, the appeal of the Scythian monks, supported by Justinian, remained unsuccessful in the time of Pope Hormisdas (514–23). In the debates of 532/3 the non-Chalcedonian bishops circulated the information that the Chalcedonian bishops would not accept that God the Word suffered in flesh.[134] Justinian took the accusation seriously and questioned his bishops. It seems that the matter of the 'one of the Trinity' was still debated among the Chalcedonians, but for Justinian the issue became of imperial importance. Several theopaschite edicts were issued in 533, and

[131] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moins de Senoun*, de Halleux, 28–31 (23–5). See also Philoxenus' *Letter to the Monks*, in *Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbug (485–519)*, ed. and trans. A. A. Vaschalde, Rome: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei 1902, 139f. (101).

[132] Philoxenus, *Lettre aux moins de Senoun*, de Halleux, 73–7 (60–4).

[133] Zachariah Rhetor, *Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique*, ed. and trans. M.-A. Kugener, in *PO* 2, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 114f. This can only refer to the theopaschite formula which the eastern Chalcedonians indeed prepared for acceptance by the papacy.

[134] Innocentius 82–6 (*ACO* IV.2, 183).

Justinian requested Pope John II's approval. Finally, eleven years after Hormisdas' death, the papacy also accepted the formula in 534, and Pope Agapetus reapproved it two years later.[135]

An endpoint in the quarrel over the Trisagion and the 'one of the Trinity' formula was set by a hymn ascribed to Justinian. It was based on an almost identical hymn by Severus, and the emperor introduced it into the Byzantine liturgy—close to the Trisagion—in 535/6:[136] 'Only-begotten Son and Word of God, who, being immortal, undertook to become incarnate from the Theotokos and always Virgin Mary for our salvation, who became a man immutably and was crucified, o Christ God, in death trampling upon death, being one of the Holy Trinity, praised together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, save us!'[137] It shows that progress had been made in liturgical matters since the hymn took into account non-Chalcedonian and Chalcedonian concerns. Christ crucified was clearly defined as God, which the non-Chalcedonians always had stressed. But he was integrated into the Holy Trinity, who together deserves the praise of humankind as the Chalcedonians had emphasized. The soteriological aspect was spelled out: through his death Christ conquered death. Justinian furthermore enhanced this aspect by changing the ending in the Severian version from 'have mercy on us' to 'save us'.[138] It was a hymn which was accepted in both traditions, the Greek Chalcedonian as well as the Syrian non-Chalcedonian.

[135] About the debates between Justinian and the Chalcedonian bishops see K.-H. Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Aug.* 39 (1999), 32f. Maybe Justinian already published a law favouring the theopaschite formula in 527; see H. S. Alivisatos, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I.*, Aalen: Scientia 1973 [Berlin: Trowitzsch & Son 1913], 23–5. Concerning the papacy see Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 34–6. Dionysius Exiguus had translated the *Tome* of Proclus into Latin for the papacy around 519–21; see L. van Rompay, 'Proclus of Constantinople's "Tomos ad Armenios" in the Post-Chalcedonian Tradition', 427f. For Agapetus and the reapproval see Chapter 5.

[136] G. Bühring and S. Uhlig, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', *OstKSt* 37 (1988), 297–307. See also J. H. Barkhuizen, 'Justinian's Hymn', *BZ* 77 (1984), 3–5. For the date see Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6028, de Boor, 216 (Mango and Scott, 314); Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 38f.

[137] For the Greek text see Bühring and Uhlig, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', 297; for a translation of the Syriac translation of Severus' text see *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. i, Brightman, 77.

[138] See Bühring and Uhlig, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', 304.

Therefore had it been for the liturgy and the way the liturgy defines Christ as the part of the Holy Trinity who suffered, Chalcedonians—from the East as well as from Constantinople—and non-Chalcedonians might have come to an agreement. Although the quarrels lasted for decades and provoked riots among believers, eastern Christians seem to have been closer here than in other points of dispute like the diptychs. Zachariah Rhetor's and Philoxenus' fears prove that the average believer might have been satisfied with the Chalcedonian understanding of 'one of the Trinity suffered'.

The ecclesiastical development did not follow the progress in liturgical understanding. On the contrary, matters evolved speedily towards the establishment of a separate non-Chalcedonian church which did not need to take into consideration liturgical preferences of the Chalcedonians. Even before Justinian approached the problem of the liturgy, the split between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians had reached a new level because the non-Chalcedonians started to ordain their own clergy.

NON-CHALCEDONIAN ORDINATIONS

The administration of non-Chalcedonian communities by non-Chalcedonian bishops in exile went partly parallel to the process of ordinations. To speak with de Lubac: the Eucharist makes the Church or, in the case of the non-Chalcedonians in the 520s, the Eucharist caused the establishment of a non-Chalcedonian hierarchy.[139] The non-Chalcedonians started to ordain priests slightly later than they provided pastoral care from exile. At least this is true for Severus, who continued to offer pastoral care immediately after he had left Antioch for Egypt in 519. John of Tella on the other hand wrote his *Canons* and *Questions and Answers* probably at the same time as he started to ordain non-Chalcedonian priests.

John of Ephesus notes in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* that 'when the period of persecution had lasted about ten years, the rest of the believers everywhere were in difficulties about ordinations; and they began to

[139] See S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'The Politicisation of the Byzantine Saint', in *The Byzantine Saint: University of Birmingham Fourteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine*

have recourse to the believing bishops [...] Then all the bishops assembled together, and considered what to do.'[140] Although the bishops realized the urgent need for non-Chalcedonian sacraments, they hesitated to ordain priests who could supply the sacraments to the laity. Apparently they feared if they did so they would give a pretext to the Chalcedonians to persecute them. John of Tella resisted the majority and requested a mandate from Severus and the other bishops to ordain priests at his own risk.[141] Receiving the licence from the non-Chalcedonian bishops and Severus, John became the main force behind the non-Chalcedonian ordinations, although he might have received support from Thomas of Dara and perhaps also Sergius of Cyrrhus, Marion of Sura, and Nonnus of Circesium.[142]

John of Ephesus' statement that ordinations started ten years after the persecutions began cannot be trusted. He clearly exaggerates the time span since he was ordained deacon in 529, at a time when John of Tella had already ordained for quite a while.[143] The meaning of the 'rest of the believers everywhere' is also questionable. Does 'believers' mean first of all monks—like the monks from Mar Bassus who requested ordinations from Severus—or the broader laity? The number of ordinations presented by John of Ephesus speak for more priests than all non-Chalcedonian monasteries would need—even if these numbers presented by John are exaggerated.[144] John of Tella wrote his *Canons* for parish priests, not priests in monasteries.[145] Therefore John provided not only non-Chalcedonian monasteries but also the broader laity with priests.

This does not mean that ordinations originally started on such a wide scale. On the contrary, John of Ephesus explicitly speaks of the distress of 'the believers who had been banished from every quarter'.

Studies, ed. S. Hackel, Studies Supplementary to Sobornost 5, London: Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, 1981, 38.

[140] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 515f.

[141] Elias in his *Life of John of Tella* corroborates the story; Brooks, 59 (Ghanem, 69).

[142] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60f. (Ghanem, 71).

[143] Also Brooks in his edition mistrusted John: John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 515 n. 3. Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis*, 101, states that John started to ordain priests before 527.

[144] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 518 and 522: a total of 170,000 ordinations. For a discussion of the number of these ordinations see Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 74–6.

[145] John of Tella, *Canons*, title, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 145 (142).

This can only refer to the monks who had been expelled by the Chalcedonians, and now forced the non-Chalcedonian bishops to assemble and discuss the matter of ordinations.

The question is when did the non-Chalcedonian bishops assemble and when did John of Tella start to ordain priests? John of Ephesus states that the non-Chalcedonian bishops did 'a few things in secret' before John of Tella started his mass ordinations. The secret ordinations, however, probably do not refer to the ordinations of priests for Mar Bassus. In his letter to the archimandrite Severus makes clear that the archimandrite's request was legitimate and a necessity which in times of persecution any non-Chalcedonian bishop could fulfil.[146] He assured the archimandrite that he also wrote to Sergius of Cyrrhus and Marion of Sura. In his letter to the latter Severus discussed the quest for ordination more generally and asked them 'that either you or others with your sanction may carry out the duty which thus presents itself and is urgent: that is upon the archimandrites presenting with their testimony those who ought to be duly advanced to the ministry of sacraments'.[147] Severus realized that Mar Bassus might only be one among many monasteries which sooner or later would be without priests if the non-Chalcedonian bishops did not act soon. The archimandrites of the non-Chalcedonian monasteries needed to select able candidates now so that their monasteries would not be unprepared in their need for priests. Therefore Severus expected the non-Chalcedonian bishops to discuss this matter, come up with a solution that would apply to every non-Chalcedonian monastery, and report back to him.

John of Ephesus' note regarding the assembly of non-Chalcedonian bishops can only refer to the non-Chalcedonian bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch. Around the same time when Severus wrote the letter to Sergius of Cyrrhus and Marion of Sura, he was concerned about the spread of the Julianist heresy. As mentioned above, the non-Chalcedonian bishops John of Tella, Sergius of Cyrrhus, Marion of Sura, and Nonnus of Circesium wrote an anti-Julianist letter to the archimandrites. Since the non-Chalcedonian bishops probably could not move around in the patriarchate of Antioch as

[146] Severus, *Select Letters* I.59, Brooks, 197f. (176f.).
[147] Severus, *Select Letters* V.15, Brooks, 403 (357).

freely as they might have wished, they perhaps decided about the issue of ordinations at the same time as they assembled to draw up the anti-Julianist letter. In this case they probably approached the archimandrites about the ordinations in a separate letter that did not survive.[148]

Considering the hesitation of the non-Chalcedonian bishops to ordain priests, John of Tella's zeal to do this on his own if the others gave him permission seems genuine. However, Severus initiated the ordinations, and after he heard back from the non-Chalcedonian bishops in the patriarchate of Antioch, John 'received letters of authorization from the holy Patriarch Severus and from the bishops and archbishops'.[149] As Severus wrote the letter to the archimandrite of Mar Bassus between 522 and 525, John must have started to ordain priests at this time, probably as early as 522/3.[150]

Nevertheless, it might be that non-Chalcedonian monasteries remained islands of non-Chalcedonian church life for a while after the Chalcedonians had expelled the non-Chalcedonian bishops by July 522. It is unclear whether the non-Chalcedonian laity used this opportunity to receive the sacraments in nearby monasteries. Evans assumes that 'the persecution forced many monks to mingle with the general populace'.[151] The fact that the Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida, Abraham bar Kayli, registered every woman so that he could control her if she brought her infant to his church for baptism implies that parents might have had the opportunity to receive baptism for the children somewhere else.[152] After 536 the Chalcedonians forbade the

[148] Severus seems to have sent letters to Thomas, John, and Philoxenus around Marde and to Sergius and Marion at the same time. The latter letter did not survive, but is mentioned in Severus, *Select Letters* V.15, Brooks, 403 (357). In this lost letter he asked the bishops to take care of the ordinations for Mar Bassus, but might have also mentioned the Julianist issue as he did in the letter to the first three bishops. The two parties of bishops also shared the letters of Severus; see Severus, *Select Letters* V.15, Brooks, 396 (352f.).

[149] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 59 (Ghanem, 69).

[150] If John of Tella wrote his *Canons* for priests he had ordained (which is very likely), then he must have started ordinations before Philoxenus' death in 523 as Canon 1 in his *Canons* mentions Philoxenus, but gives no indication that the bishop of Mabbug was already dead; see Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 49f.

[151] J. A. S. Evans, 'The Monophysite Persecution: The Eastern View', *The Ancient World* 27 (1996), 194.

[152] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 34 (Harrak, 61).

populace to admit expelled monks to their houses, and thereby tried to prevent any intermingling between monks and the general laity.[153]

What started with a complaint by monks about a shortage of priests for the sacraments became a project that endeavoured to ordain as many non-Chalcedonian clerics as possible. As John certainly did not only intend to fill vacancies, he threatened the foundation of the imperial church by flooding the bishoprics with clergy who actively opposed the official Chalcedonian bishops. John actively searched for appropriate candidates by employing 'men of knowledge' in the provinces of the patriarchate of Antioch who could find candidates for him.[154] They received 'the impress of his name and monogram' from John. They selected appropriate candidates in their areas and probably used John's monogram (maybe in the form of a seal) to certify their letters of introduction. Then they sent these pre-approved candidates with the official letter of introduction to John for ordination. John only ordained men who brought this letter, and also kept records of his ordinations. After the Chalcedonians caught him in 537 'they also hunted for the documents that contained [...] the names of the believers who received the priesthood from him'.[155] Even in exile and under uncomfortable conditions the non-Chalcedonians painstakingly tried to follow the proper procedure of church law.

The overall careful procedure seems to have been John's initiative. It could have been, of course, also Severus' request that, if he gave his authorization for ordinations, then John needed to take great care in choosing only appropriate candidates. The fact that John kept records of those he had ordained demonstrates that the non-Chalcedonians learned from a problem that already existed in the patriarchate of Antioch before 518 and continued afterwards. False priests, that is, people whom someone ordained who was not a bishop, appear to have been rather common:

> Concerning the people who say that they are priests but cannot indicate which bishop ordained them, and who, when they are asked as to how this took place, say that the Gospel was placed on their head—it is right to know that these

[153] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 43 (Harrak, 67).
[154] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 519.
[155] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 522.

have not been ordained by a bishop, for there is no bishop who does not know that the Gospel is not placed on the head of the cleric in ordination.[156]

Shortly after Severus left Antioch, but apparently before the new Chalcedonian bishops arrived, people who claimed to be bishops established themselves in Antioch and Emesa.[157] The non-Chalcedonian canons from post-518 warned their followers of people who claimed to be priests, but might have been ordained by persons like Zakkai, Zebad, or others who had never been ordained bishops.[158] Heresies also posed a threat and the non-Chalcedonian bishops in Egypt apparently got caught in a trap. They ordained Julianists from the patriarchate of Antioch without knowing that they were Julianists.[159] By requiring his candidates to present a letter of introduction, John of Tella tried to avoid this happening to him, too.

John ordained priests and deacons for villages and, as some of them lacked a proper ecclesiastical education, gave them instructions, orally or written like his *Canons* or his *Regula ad Diaconos*, so that they knew their duties. The sources emphasize John of Tella's care only to admit candidates who were able to read the Scriptures, repeat the Psalms and write their names and signatures.[160] Considering that John of Tella—

[156] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 22, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 168 (161).

[157] Severus, *Select Letters* II.3, Brooks, 231–57 (207–29). It is not clear what happened to the metropolitan of Emesa in 518/19. No bishop of Emesa is among the expelled non-Chalcedonian bishops. It might have been the case that Julian, who was non-Chalcedonian and metropolitan of Emesa some time between 514 and 518, died just in 518/19, so that a false bishop was able to take over in these unstable years; for Julian see Severus, *Select Letters* I.5, Brooks, 38 (35).

[158] Not much is known about these false bishops and priests. For Zebad and Zakkai (and also Procopius, the Julianist party of Ishaq, and Lampetians) see *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 1, 25 and 42, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 163 (157), 169f. (162f.), 176 (168) and *From a Letter which One of the Venerable Bishops Wrote to his Friend* 6 and 7, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 181f. (172f.). For the latter text see Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen*, vol. i, 182–6, who dates it to the sixth century. Ordinations by Zebad are still a problem after 536; see Thomas of Germanicia, *Letter to the Archimandrite John of Mar Eusebius*, BL Add. 14532, fols. 142a–143a, and Constantine of Laodicea and Antoninus of Aleppo, *Letter to Thomas of Germanicia*, BL Add. 14532, fols. 145a–145b. For Zebad and Zakkai see also E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951, 105–7. Lampetius was infected by the heresy of Adelphius (Severus, *Select Letters* I.13, Brooks, 61 (55)).

[159] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 33, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 174 (166).

[160] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 518.

according to John of Ephesus—ordained sometimes up to 300 priests a day, such mass ordinations could only be conducted if John's recruiters in the provinces had meticulously preselected the candidates.

John claimed that he attempted to ordain as many priests and deacons as possible, and not just to replenish vacant positions in parish churches and monasteries. Although John could have ordained bishops (he had been together for a while with other non-Chalcedonian bishops of whom three were needed in order to ordain a new bishop canonically) John did not ordain bishops because the non-Chalcedonians had already more than enough bishops in exile.[161] Newly ordained bishops would not be able to take up their sees (which, in any case, could only be sees where a non-Chalcedonian bishop had died), but the Chalcedonians would force them into exile immediately. However, the Chalcedonians could never control the infiltration of their dioceses with thousands of priests (and deacons) who could administer the sacraments—especially the Eucharist. As especially monk-priests were geographically flexible, they could offer the Eucharist to non-Chalcedonians believers everywhere in the patriarchate of Antioch. They established Eucharist communities, and took thereby the very foundation of the Church, the Eucharist, away from the Chalcedonians.

John seems to have had a different understanding of the 'Church' which may be called 'Eucharistic ecclesiology', a term first coined by the Russian Orthodox proto-presbyter and theologian Nikolas Afanassieff.[162] For Afanassieff the Church manifests itself in the local church when the bishops celebrate the sacrament of the Eucharist. John hardly ordained any bishops within the empire if any at all, but through priests he created eucharistic communities which were legally bound to him but could work practically independent.[163]

However, in order to claim legitimately to be (in the tradition of) the one apostolic Church the clerics for those communities needed to learn how to behave canonically as priests or deacons. It was important to John that all ordained priests and deacons received this proper instruction

[161] For John—supported by fellow non-Chalcedonian bishops—having ordained bishops in Persia and a possible episcopal ordination within the Roman empire see below. For a short discussion of John and episcopal ordinations see Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 80f.

[162] Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 80–9.

[163] Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 81–3.

according to the tradition of the Church.[164] In his *Canons* he requested the priests to keep the faith of Nicaea and 'to anathematize all heresies condemned since the days of the holy apostles until the time of our venerable fathers (namely) Mār Severus, patriarch of Antioch, [and] Mār Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbūg.'[165] Not only matters of faith, but also the laws and tradition of the Church remained paramount for the non-Chalcedonians. In the introduction to the *Canons* John emphasized that he did not lay down his own commandments but gave them the commandments of the scriptures and the fathers. Referring to Paul, John reminded them that these were the commandments of the Lord.[166] In his *Regula ad Diaconos* he told deacons that:[167]

> because your love seeks from our unworthiness the order of the service and of the canons we are writing [it] down for you as something which [has been handed down] by our fathers, the bishops and metropolitans who brought me to this service and raised me before their feet, and taught me this order.

Letters of instruction, canons, and questions and answers from this period show that John of Tella did not struggle alone in his effort to preserve the tradition of the Church. Emphasis on proper church law also runs through Severus' works.[168] However, it appears from John of Tella's *Canons* that some customs violating church law were quite common. John might have worked not only for preserving the proper canons, but also towards a reformation of the clergy.[169]

[164] Not all non-Chalcedonian priests knew what their duties were, had learned the Psalms, or were even able to write their names. See Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', pars. 6f. Although certainly not one of the priests John had ordained, a priest who could not write can be found in *Documenta ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustrandas*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, CSCO 17/103, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae and Leuven: E Typographeo Marcelli Istas 1907/1933, 217 (151).

[165] John of Tella, *Canons* 1, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 147 (143).

[166] John of Tella, *Canons*, introduction, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 146 (143).

[167] John of Tella, *Regula ad Diaconos*, in Menze, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*', 54–60.

[168] For the influence of a legal education on Severus see R. Roux, 'The Concept of Orthodoxy in the *Cathedral Homilies* of Severus of Antioch', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 488–93. See also V. Poggi, 'Severo di Antiochia alla Scuola di Beirut', in *L'Eredità Classica nelle Lingue Orientali*, ed. M. Pavan and U. Cozzoli, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana 1986, 57–71.

[169] Transgressions of the clergy were of course a common problem. For an overview in the ancient and early medieval world according to Latin and Greek

John had to deal with another, rather unexpected, problem as well. He was so successful that not only non-Chalcedonians came to him for ordinations but also 'some of those that were in communion with the heretics would every day arrive and come to repentance'.[170] Although John of Ephesus does not explicitly say that these heretics were Chalcedonians, this is certainly what he meant. Thomas of Germanicia remarks in a letter to the archimandrite of the Mar Eusebius monastery, John, that:

> John who is of remembrance of holiness, and was bishop in Tella, absolved those who received the ordination from the heretics, repented and turned towards the truth, and fulfilled the canon; [he absolved them] not at all only after the time of two years, but some also after four years. Through his blessing he gave permission that they be deacons or indeed priests.[171]

Thomas, quoting John, stresses John's great care to receive Chalcedonians only after 'many examinations'.[172] Considering the length of the penitence of up to four years, John indeed took greater care before admitting Chalcedonian clergy than other non-Chalcedonians. *The Ecclesiastical Canons which were Given by the Holy Fathers during Persecution*, Constantine of Laodicea's and Antoninus of Aleppo's *Letter to Thomas of Germanicia* and John of Hephaestu's *Canons* (from 538–41) required only two years of penitence from Chalcedonian clergy who had turned to the non-Chalcedonians. After two years they became full members of the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical hierarchy in the rank the Chalcedonians had ordained them before. If a non-Chalcedonian priest or deacon had lapsed and wished

sources see K. L. Noethlichs, 'Anspruch und Wirklichkeit. Fehlverhalten und Amtspflichtverletzungen des christlichen Klerus anhand der Konzilskanones des 4. bis 8. Jahrhunderts', *ZSRG.K* 76 (1990), 1–61.

[170] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 24, in *PO* 18, 519f.

[171] Thomas of Germanicia, *Letter to the Archimandrite John of Mar Eusebius*, BL Add. 14532, fols. 142a–143a, here 142b. More of this letter survives in Harvard syr. 22. See S. Brock, 'Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severus', *StPatr* 12 (1975), 17–20. The letter can be dated to 536–42: as it mentions that Severus went to Constantinople, Thomas must have written it after 536 (maybe even post-538 if 'John who is of remembrance of holiness' means that John was already dead; however, Severus died in the same year and Thomas gives no epithet to him), but before his own death in probably 542 (see above).

[172] Thomas of Germanicia quotes what John wrote to him (142b–143a). At the end of the letter, Thomas stresses the canonical admittance of Chalcedonian priests (143a).

to rejoin the ranks of the non-Chalcedonians, only one year of penitence was required before he was a full non-Chalcedonian clergyman again.[173] The canon in the *Ecclesiastical Canons which were Given by the Holy Fathers* indicates that either the cleric had chosen deliberately to defect or the Chalcedonians might have forced him.[174]

The reception of ordained Chalcedonians certainly followed the initial plan of ordaining non-Chalcedonians for non-Chalcedonian communities, but must have happened before the debates in 532/3. Both the Syriac summary of the debates as well as Elias' *Life of John of Tella* account for Justinian's request that the non-Chalcedonian bishops (or John of Tella for that matter) should not ordain anyone or perform sacerdotal ministry like baptism or Eucharist for Chalcedonians.[175]

It is difficult to locate where the non-Chalcedonians gained strength and where the Chalcedonians lost part of their clergy. John of Tella seems to have lived most of this time at the Persian border and crossed over to Persia several times. Elias reports about John's success in bringing the non-Chalcedonian belief to the Persians for whom he ordained several bishops. It is not clear if he ordained bishops exclusively for the Persians or if he ordained bishops on the Roman side of the border as well.[176] The non-Chalcedonian bishop Didymus, the addressee of two of Severus' letters written in exile, might have been ordained at this time. Except for the fact that Didymus was ordained after 518 as a non-Chalcedonian bishop, but does not appear in the list of exiled bishops, no further details

[173] *Ecclesiastical Canons which were Given by the Holy Fathers during Persecution* 1, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 159f. (154f.). They were of course immediately allowed to receive the the non-Chalcedonian Eucharist. John of Hephaestu's *Canons* have not been edited yet, but F. Nau, 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', provides a French translation. For the text, author, and date see Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen*, vol. i, 175–80.

[174] Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', par. 17.

[175] Brock, 'The Conversations', 115 with n. 86, in which he corrects Brooks' edition and translation of that passage in Elias' *Life of John of Tella*. Ghanem followed Brooks, but *Het Leven van Johannes van Tella door Elias*, ed. and trans. H. G. Kleyn, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882, 39 (L), gives the correct text and translation. That the non-Chalcedonian bishops gave in on the question of ordinations as Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 31f. remarks, cannot be verified from the sources.

[176] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60–2 (Ghanem, 70–2).

are known about him. As the list of exiled bishops may be incomplete this would not exclude an ordination around 519 like the non-Chalcedonian bishops John of Tella and Jacob of Sarug.[177] However, Severus mentioned 'the sufferings of the persecuted church which it has suffered for the sake of the sound word of faith and is still even now suffering', which seem to indicate that the non-Chalcedonians had already suffered for a while.[178] On the other hand, it is unlikely that Didymus was ordained bishop shortly after 521 when the Chalcedonians had consolidated their position, and it would hardly make sense for John to ordain another non-Chalcedonian bishop. John might have ordained him some time around 530, and if so, then probably for a see close to the Persian border.[179]

Be this as it may, it becomes clear that the non-Chalcedonians strengthened their position after the first wave of expulsions in 519–22. Many priests and laity who under the first shock gave in to the imperial order turned or returned to the non-Chalcedonians. Non-Chalcedonian ordinations threatened the authority of the Chalcedonians because they gave the laity a choice between Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian sacraments. The success of John of Tella's mass ordinations became visible in 530 when 'holy letters were sent to the cities in order that they who did not take communion in the holy churches were to be sent into exile because they pleaded as excuse that the council of Chalcedon [that is, the Council] of the 630 bishops was named'.[180] Apparently the emperor realized, or Ephrem of Amida had informed him, that more and more Christians did not take the Eucharist in the official Chalcedonian churches, but probably with Eucharist communities established through John's ordinations. Justinian had little success with his edict in enforcing a strict Chalcedonian policy. A riot broke out in Antioch and the rioters

[177] For the question of how complete the list is see Chapter 2.

[178] Severus, *Select Letters* I.57, Brooks, 192f. (174).

[179] Brooks in his edition thought that Didymus might have become bishop somewhere in Syria when Mundir made an attack on Syria in the early 520s because a barbarian invasion is mentioned. However, Mundir made his raid in 529; see I. Shahîd, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, vol. i, parts 1 and 2, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks 1995, 79–82. If the suggestion here is correct, the barbarian invasion rather applies to the Huns which invaded the empire from the north in 530.

[180] John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVIII.64, Thurn, 391.

attacked the residence of the patriarch. The *comes Orientis* suppressed the riot, and the emperor ordered the punishment of many non-Chalcedonians.

It can therefore be concluded that by 530 the non-Chalcedonians had established a powerful network of priests, and the Chalcedonians failed to control the sacraments in the patriarchate of Antioch. The non-Chalcedonians had begun to establish a rival hierarchy that challenged the Chalcedonians' claim to represent the church of the empire. Although Chalcedon remained the official doctrine for more than a decade, the non-Chalcedonian episcopate hid in exile, and several monasteries had been shut down because the monks threatened the Chalcedonian authorities in one way or the other, and no progress had been made to suppress non-Chalcedonianism in general.

On the contrary, the non-Chalcedonians had gained strength again, and they threatened the authorities at the heart of the patriarchate, in Antioch, with violence. Justinian reconsidered his policy, recalled the monks and requested the non-Chalcedonian bishops to come to Constantinople to discuss matters of faith. Therefore the debates in 532/3 must be seen as a discussion in which the emperor tried to determine in which direction his religious policy should turn. As the non-Chalcedonian bishops claimed that they were not entitled to make any decisions without Severus, Justinian needed to wait for the former patriarch of Antioch to arrive in the imperial capital.

THE EARLY 530s: JUSTINIAN'S POLICY OF RAPPROCHEMENT

Although scholars debate the exact date of his arrival in Constantinople, Severus finally—after several years of delay—arrived in Constantinople.[181] The question then must be raised: Why? Why did Severus come to Constantinople after he made perfectly clear earlier in a letter to Justinian that it would be inappropriate for him to come?[182] Why did

[181] For the date of his arrival see below.

[182] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.16, Brooks, 123–31 (Brooks, 85–90; Hamilton and Brooks, 254–61).

Justinian still request Severus to come to the capital although he could not reach an agreement with the non-Chalcedonian bishops from the patriarchate of Antioch?

It might be easier to start with the latter question. Justinian needed imperial harmony at the very least, ecclesiastical unity at best. The fact that the non-Chalcedonian bishops refused the emperor's request in his presence in 532/3 not to perform sacerdotal ministry for the Chalcedonians must have greatly alarmed Justinian. The non-Chalcedonians even accused Justinian of being responsible for the state of the church, and also Justinian's threat to exile them to Zeugma did not bear any fruit.[183] A strong opposition which could refuse to comply with the imperial will was uncalled-for, especially at the eastern frontier. The non-Chalcedonian bishops lived far away from the capital in exile under a government that discriminated against them for almost fifteen years. They were more concerned about the well-being of their communities than the imperial interests in Constantinople, and the emperor needed to change this before they became completely alienated from Byzantium.

Justinian seems to have therefore transferred the ecclesiastical problems to Constantinople. They were not solved thereby, but much more under control—or as Pazdernik phrased it: 'Holding the dissidents in Constantinople permitted the authorities to keep them supervised and to take them out of circulation, depriving their congregations of their pastoral care.'[184] In general, emperors did not wish to have problems in their capital, but Justinian had cleaned Constantinople of any rivals and other oppositions in the Nika riots of 532, and could now focus on the non-Chalcedonian problem.[185]

In order not to offend the Chalcedonians, he could of course not officially question the Council of Chalcedon and call for a round table. The emperor organized the debate in 532/3 unofficially, without his own presence in the debate.[186] If Justinian had not known

[183] Brock, 'The Conversations', 115.

[184] Ch. Pazdernik, '"Our Most Pious Consort Given Us by God": Dissident Reactions to the Partnership of Justinian and Theodora, A.D. 525–548', *ClA* 13.2 (1994), 275.

[185] For the hypothesis that Justinian had staged the Nika revolt see M. Meier, 'Die Inszenierung einer Katastrophe: Justinian und der Nika-Aufstand', *ZPE* 142 (2003), 273–300. See also G. Greatrex, 'The Nika Revolt: A Reappraisal', *JHS* 117 (1997), 60–86.

[186] His wife Theodora organized a 'refugee camp' for the non-Chalcedonians in the palace of Hormisdas probably in the mid-530s. See Chapter 5.

before that Severus was the key for an agreement with the non-Chalcedonians, the non-Chalcedonians revealed it to him in 532/3.[187] Justinian's requests at the end of the debate, especially the acceptance of the *libellus*, did not help to have Severus reconsider his refusal to come to the capital. Therefore, Justinian needed to make adjustments to his ecclesiastical policy which might persuade Severus to change his mind.

First of all the emperor—grumpily no doubt—let the non-Chalcedonian bishops return to the East although they had bluntly refused his requests.[188] If he had not, Severus could not hope for a better treatment if he arrived at the capital. Justinian's next steps remain subtle, but cannot conceal that he seriously hoped for an arrangement with the non-Chalcedonians. His edict of 15 March 533, published in Constantinople, but also sent to the major cities in the empire, emphasized the theopaschite formula, but did not mention Chalcedon at all.[189]

The omission of Chalcedon could not have been a lapse and, apparently, a confused patriarch of Constantinople asked the emperor about its significance. In his answer, and also in a letter to the pope, Justinian confirmed that he believed in Chalcedon. However, this private communication did not have the same impact as a published edict.[190]

[187] As discussed in Chapter 2, the non-Chalcedonians avoided making any concessions without their patriarch.

[188] Maybe Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's note that the non-Chalcedonian bishops remained in Constantinople for a year, although there seemed to have been no further meetings, might refer to a time of semi-confinement. The emperor might have put pressure on them that they needed to make some concessions, but in the end he had no choice but let them go; see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 122 (Brooks, 84; Hamilton and Brooks, 253).

[189] *Cod. Iust.* I.1.6, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. ii: *Codex Iustinianus*, ed. P. Krueger, Berlin: Weidmann 1906, 7–8; For a comparison of the texts of the edict in the Justinianic Code and John Malalas see R. Scott, 'Malalas and Justinian's Codification', in *Byzantine Papers*, ed. E. and M. Jeffreys and A. Moffatt, Canberra: Australian National University 1981, 12–31; Scott, 16, concludes that the edict was sent to Rome, Alexandria, and Thessalonica as well, although the Code did not mention these cities as destinations for the edict.

[190] It is not known if the patriarch requested an explanation, but as Chalcedon was not mentioned in the published edict, and Justinian wrote to his patriarch on the faith of the church only eleven days after he had published the edict, it seems highly likely; for the letters to the patriarch and the pope see *Cod. Iust.* I.1.7–8, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. ii, 8–12.

This theopaschite edict was reissued after an earthquake in November 533, after which 'the city gathered' and cried out: 'Crucified one, save us and the city; Augustus Justinian, may you be victorious. Destroy, burn the document issued by the bishops of the Synod of Chalcedon.'[191] Who the non-Chalcedonians among the crowd were, cannot be detected, but the sources suggest that non-Chalcedonians became more vocal in Constantinople at the beginning of the 530s. Zooras, the Syrian Stylite, might have already been in the city, although John of Ephesus does not mention the earthquake in his description of Zooras' life. He could freely move around in Constantinople and baptized influential Constantinopolitans—even the children of imperial guards.[192] At about the same time Peter of Apamea also appeared in the capital and was not hindered from spreading non-Chalcedonian propaganda. As discussed above, Justinian seems to have composed a theopaschite hymn on the basis of a hymn by Severus and introduced it into the Byzantine liturgy in 535. Could Severus have asked for more than a capital in which the non-Chalcedonians gained ground and an emperor who used Severus' works in order to compose his own hymns and request them to be sung in the churches?

Perhaps Severus received one more confirmation that Justinian seriously reconsidered ecclesiastical matters: so far Alexandria had been undisturbed by the quarrels over Chalcedon after 518. This changed now. After the death of the patriarch Timothy IV in February 535, a friend and acquaintance of Severus, Theodosius, was elected patriarch in Alexandria.[193] But he did not seem to have the popular vote, and a Julianist, Gaianus, was also elected.[194] According

[191] *Chronicon Paschale*, Dindorf, 629 (Whitby and Whitby, 128). See also J. Speigl, 'Formula Iustiniani. Kircheneinigung mit kaiserlichen Glaubensbekenntnissen', *OstKSt* 44 (1995), 114–30.

[192] *ACO* III, 139.1–4; J. Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *OstKSt* 43 (1994), 114.

[193] For the dates see also S. G. Richter, *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens*, Wiesbaden: Reichert 2002, 108–10.

[194] Liberatus, *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* 20, ed. E. Schwartz, in *ACO* II.5, Berlin: de Gruyter 1936, 134f.; Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 135 (Brooks, 93; Hamilton and Brooks, 266); *The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.) Coptic Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. R. H. Charles, Text and Translation Society 3, London 1916, chapter 92.

to John of Nikiu, Justinian ordered the military commander of Egypt to drive out Gaianus and reinstate Theodosius. Since his reinstatement took three months, Theodosius must have come to office in May of 535, which fits neatly to the fact that he sent a synodical letter to Severus in June 535.[195] Severus replied on 26 July 535, but the interesting part of the letter is not what Severus wrote, but what he did not mention. Severus made no note about the election of a new patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimus, who succeeded (maybe at the end of June/beginning of July) the Chalcedonian patriarch Epiphanius who died on 5 June 535. Severus would have mentioned the election of a new patriarch of Constantinople in this letter, and the fact that he did not remark on it leads to the conclusion that he had not yet been in Constantinople in July 535 and had not heard about the election.[196]

Did the support of his friend Theodosius finally change Severus' mind? If not from anyone else then Severus must have heard about the events in Alexandria and Justinian's involvement from the messenger who brought him Theodosius' synodical letter. If Justinian had wanted to weaken the (Severian) non-Chalcedonians he should have supported Gaianus. The fact that he opted for Theodosius shows that Justinian worked for a policy of rapprochement towards the (Severian) non-Chalcedonians.[197]

The summer of 535 marks the high-point of Justinian's policy of rapprochement when he made Anthimus patriarch of Constantinople and Severus finally agreed to come to Constantinople. When Severus arrived in Constantinople, probably in September 535, however, the situation in the capital changed. The Chalcedonians started to lobby against the patriarch Anthimus, and a policy of rapprochement became impossible. The council of 536 condemned Anthimus,

[195] *Documenta ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustrandas*, Chabot, 5–11 (1–5).

[196] Already Ernest Stein rejected Eduard Schwartz's chronology, who favoured an arrival of Severus in Constantinople in the winter of 534/5. E. Stein, 'Cyrille de Scythopolis. À propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres', *AnBoll* 62 (1944), 181f. against *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1939, 393.

[197] The African deacon Liberatus accused Theodora of having intrigued on behalf of Theodosius, but even if she did, it seems unlikely that she could have deployed the military on Theodosius' behalf without Justinian's consent; Liberatus, *Breviarium* 20, *ACO* II.5, 134f. See Chapter 5.

Severus, and other non-Chalcedonians, and requested that the emperor would issue laws against the non-Chalcedonians.[198]

CONCLUSION

Henri de Lubac's phrase that 'the Eucharist makes the Church' describes very well the development which the separation of the non-Chalcedonians took in the 520s. John of Tella's mass ordinations instituted an ecclesiastical hierarchy in exile. The decisiveness of this step can hardly be overestimated—as well as the potential danger it could bring to the non-Chalcedonians.

Church law required that only the bishop of a province was allowed to ordain anyone in this province either for monasteries or for villages. In the case of the Mar Bassus monastery, Severus overruled this canon by stating that in times of persecution any (non-Chalcedonian) bishop could ordain priests for Mar Bassus. Considering the steadfast non-Chalcedonianism of Mar Bassus, it is not surprising that the monks of this monastery approached Severus to ask for ordinations. The same is true with the 'expelled believers', probably the monks from Amida, who also asked the non-Chalcedonian bishops to ordain priests and deacons for them according to John of Ephesus.[199] Both the Mar Bassus monastery and the monasteries of Amida were front-runners for the non-Chalcedonian cause whereas other monasteries might have hesitated and waited to see what other monasteries did about a shortage of clergy. Severus wanted all non-Chalcedonian monasteries to be prepared for ordination.

Undertaking ordinations was a dangerous step because the non-Chalcedonians could be accused of establishing a church against both the imperial will and the wishes of the majority of Christians. So far

[198] The monks requested in a letter to Menas, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople and successor of Anthimus, that the emperor should forbid any non-Chalcedonian activity and seize the property of those people on whose ground the non-Chalcedonians celebrated the mysteries; *ACO* III, 43; see Chapter 5.

[199] Of course, John could also have in mind the expelled monks from monasteries around Edessa, or both groups. But the Amidene monks seemed to have been more determined and John of Ephesus probably referred to them.

the non-Chalcedonian bishops could comfortably claim their legitimacy as elected and ordained bishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs whom the new religious policy after 518 persecuted. The proof that the non-Chalcedonians, who preferred exile for their belief, were heretics was with the Chalcedonians. By establishing a counter-hierarchy the need for proof shifted towards the non-Chalcedonians. They needed to defend their reasons for establishing a hierarchy against an existing hierarchy which was approved by imperial will.

If the non-Chalcedonian ordinations failed to keep a considerable number of monasteries and communities on the side of the non-Chalcedonians, the non-Chalcedonian bishops were compromised. They would have proved to be truly schismatics because they had left their sees and dared to establish a counter-hierarchy, but nevertheless remained marginalized. It is therefore understandable that the non-Chalcedonians let only one bishop help monasteries and communities to face the shortage of clergy. Despite the potential danger—perhaps because Severus favoured a general decision on how to proceed concerning ordinations—the non-Chalcedonian bishops did not hesitate for long but appointed John of Tella for this task. Since John had success, the non-Chalcedonian cause was not lost, but strengthened. The Chalcedonians could hardly claim to be the church of the empire if they had lost control of the faithful in the patriarchate of Antioch, not to speak of Egypt. A claim for a universal Christian Church certainly would have looked different.

Although exaggerated, John of Ephesus' numbers of people who came to John of Tella illustrate the overwhelming response to join the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical ranks. The requests of Chalcedonian clergy to join the ranks of the non-Chalcedonians as well might have taken the non-Chalcedonian bishops by surprise and forced them to issue appropriate canons about the penitence of those candidates. John of Tella's frank refusal in 532/3 to comply with Justinian's request not to perform ordinations demonstrates that John spoke from a position of strength.

John's mass ordinations threatened the Chalcedonian church as they took away its foundation, the Eucharist communities which made the Church, according to de Lubac. The non-Chalcedonian hierarchy established by 530 was not just a regional or marginalized underground hierarchy like that of small sects or pagans who survived

in the sixth century. Paul of Callinicum in Edessa, the deacon in Harran, and the riots in Antioch in 530 indicate that the non-Chalcedonians had moved back into the cities from which the Chalcedonians had driven them out in 519/22.[200] The non-Chalcedonian counter-hierarchy was therefore probably visible, and the Chalcedonians were aware that this non-Chalcedonian hierarchy performed the sacraments for their faithful. By 530 the Chalcedonians faced a powerful opposition. The imperial edict of 530 was a desperate attempt to suppress this opposition, and its failure brought about a change of the imperial policy which lasted until 536.

[200] Paul of Callinicum was in Edessa in 528, where he translated some of Severus' works (see Chapter 3); the deacon might have been caught in Harran not before 536.

5

Syrian Orthodox Commemoration of the Past

INTRODUCTION

Decades after Justinian's policy of rapprochement had failed, John of Ephesus reflected on the recent history of the non-Chalcedonians in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* and his *Church History*. He did so, however, not as an objective observer. Rather, he approached his subject within a framework of persecuted non-Chalcedonians and persecuting Chalcedonians. John was born around 507 north of Amida, and joined a monastery there at the very time when the Chalcedonians took over in Amida. He suffered the fate of expulsion like his fellow monks, and in exile he met many ascetics about whom he wrote later in Constantinople. He became one of the first bishops of the evolving Syrian Orthodox Church when Jacob Baradaeus ordained him bishop of Ephesus around 558.[1]

In his works scholars can hardly find the average non-Chalcedonian or average Chalcedonian. John was not interested in the wavering non-Chalcedonian priest whom the *libellus* brought into a personal

[1] J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian of the Sixth-Century Byzantium', Diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 1995, 32. Jacob Baradaeus has been credited with being the founder of the Syrian Orthodox Church; see H. G. Kleyn, *Jacob Baradaeus. De Stichter der syrische monophysietische Kerk*, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882, 62, but other scholars have also pointed out how crucial John of Tella's ordinations were for the establishment of the Syrian Orthodox Church; see W. H. C. Frend, 'Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy', in *The Heritage of the Early Church*, ed. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, OCA 195, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1973, 261–75 and A. Vööbus, 'The Origin of the Monophysite Church in Syria and Mesopotamia', *ChH* 42 (1973), 17–26.

dilemma and who might have chosen the easy way out by submitting to the authority of his new bishop. John focused on the persons who should be remembered for the steadfastness of their faith and their sufferings. These were first of all ascetics and solitaries. In the later parts of the *Eastern Saints*, he also included bishops such as John of Tella and Severus of Antioch. It was important to remember this first generation of bishops who suffered from the Chalcedonians but nevertheless preserved their orthodox faith. These bishops represented the post-Chalcedonian and post-518 past for the later Syrian Orthodox. John of Ephesus established a counter-identity for the non-Chalcedonians against the Chalcedonians who could identify themselves with the church of the empire.

In the 530s and 540s a few people gained primary importance for the non-Chalcedonians and for the commemoration of their past: Anthimus, who became Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople but, switching sides, embraced non-Chalcedonianism, and the empress Theodora. The two represented the (almost) highest ecclesiastical and secular powers in the state and proved—in the reading of the non-Chalcedonians—that the non-Chalcedonian persuasion was suitable as orthodox doctrine of the empire.

The significance of Anthimus and Theodora as icons for the Syrian Orthodox can only be truly understood by reading against the grain of the public memory of the two which is distorted not only by non-Chalcedonian praises but also by the Chalcedonians, who condemned Anthimus, and by Procopius, whose notorious image of Theodora still puzzles scholars today. Also Elias' *Life of John of Tella* is analysed here and compared with that of Peter the Iberian, an earlier non-Chalcedonian saint's life (end of the fifth century), in order to understand how the self-understanding of the non-Chalcedonians had changed. Finally, a case study of Abraham bar Kayli will demonstrate how John of Ephesus' framework of persecuted non-Chalcedonian saints and Chalcedonian persecutors mystified the remembrance of this Chalcedonian metropolitan and let him become the 'archvillain' in the Syrian Orthodox tradition.[2]

[2] For the terms 'archvillain' and 'archfiend' as applying to Abraham bar Kayli see Chapter 3.

ANTHIMUS: AN ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

Scholars often regard the case of Anthimus as an unfortunate 'affair' for Justinian, or see in it the influence of Theodora, who wanted to have a non-Chalcedonian patriarch in Constantinople.[3] The fact is that Anthimus was elected as a Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople after Epiphanius died on 5 June 535, but later in his short tenure (June/July 535 to early March 536) embraced non-Chalcedonianism. Throughout his tenure as patriarch he did not publicize his switch of affiliation. Nevertheless, his doctrinal position was regarded as questionable very shortly after his consecration, with the result that the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem of Amida, and Chalcedonian monks in Constantinople sent worried letters to Pope Agapetus.[4] However, letters alone would not have caused such turbulences in Constantinople. But the decision of the Ostrogoth king Theodahad to send Pope Agapetus as ambassador to Constantinople probably changed the course of church history significantly.

Before Anthimus became patriarch of Constantinople he had been appointed bishop of Trebizond, some time after 518, but before 532/3.[5] However, he preferred to live quietly as an ascetic in Constantinople, where he was known as a lover of the poor and was theologically versed enough to participate in the debate of 532/3 on the side of the Chalcedonians.[6] His election to the patriarchal see of

[3] The classical account of Justinian's alleged 'zigzag' policy is E. Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', in SBAW.PH 2, Munich 1940, 32–72; J. A. S. Evans, *The Empress Theodora: Partner of Justinian*, Austin: University of Texas Press 2002, 79: 'he was Theodora's man', which seems to be the *communis opinio*. K.-H. Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Aug.* 39 (1999), 39–44, considers the election of Anthimus as 'affair'.

[4] A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989, 366 with n. 149; for the following see especially J. Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *OstKSt* 43 (1994), 105–53. Ephrem had already regarded Anthimus' doctrinal position as questionable before Anthimus' patriarchal election; see below.

[5] E. Honigmann, 'Anthimus of Trebizond, Patriarch of Constantinople (June 535–March 536)', in *idem*, *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1953, 185–93.

[6] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 135 (Brooks, 93; Hamilton and Brooks, 265); S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 87–121.

Constantinople in 535 was not canonical, but this had certainly been known at the time of his patriarchal election, and apparently dismissed by the majority of the Constantinopolitan clergy and the ordaining bishops.[7] These clerics hardly had the authority or authorization to question Anthimus' election afterwards.

Anthimus' downfall was not caused by any Constantinopolitan clergy or eastern bishop, but by Pope Agapetus. He arrived rather unexpectedly as ambassador of Theodahad in Constantinople in March 536.[8] As the pope had been informed about Anthimus' strange doctrinal opinions, Agapetus refused to take communion with the patriarch on the ground that Anthimus had translated his bishopric from Trebizond to Constantinople. It seems unlikely that the pope would have minded the translation if Anthimus would have been as steadfast a Chalcedonian as, for example, Ephrem of Amida. But as Agapetus had reason—without knowing it for a fact—to be suspicious about Anthimus' doctrinal views, it was certainly convenient to be able to refuse communion with him until the pope would have found the time to judge Anthimus' orthodoxy more thoroughly.[9]

However, the sequence of events followed now in rapid succession. Probably less than ten days went by from the moment in which the pope refused to have communion with Anthimus until Anthimus stepped down from his office, gave back his pall to Justinian, started to have communion with the non-Chalcedonian patriarchs Severus and Theodosius, and Agapetus ordained a new patriarch of Constantinople on

[7] Even if Anthimus had not been their choice (see below), they obviously did not oppose his election.

[8] *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum*, vol.i: *Libri Pontificalis pars prior*, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH, Berlin: Weidmann 1898, 142f. (trans. *The Book of Pontiffs* (Liber Pontificalis): *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, trans. R. Davis, TTH 6, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000, 52f.). For the date of Agapetus' arrival see Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 137 (Brooks, 94; Hamilton and Brooks, 267). For Agapetus see V. Grumel, 'La papauté à Byzance. Saint Agapet (535–536)', *EstFr* 39 (1927), 11–27; W. Ensslin, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', *HJ* 77 (1958), 459–66; J. Hofmann, 'Der hl. Papst Agapit I. und die Kirche von Byzanz', *OstKSt* 40 (1991), 113–32. In general for the relationship between the papacy and Constantinople see the short but excellent introduction by C. Sotinel, 'Emperors and Popes in the Sixth Century: The Western View', in M. Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005, 267–90.

[9] Of course, after proving his orthodoxy, Anthimus could have only regained the see of Trebizond, not the patriarchal see.

March 13.[10] Less than two months later the Chalcedonians held a general council in May/June 536 and condemned Anthimus as a heretic along with Severus *et alii*, thereby also abruptly stopping Justinian's policy of rapprochement.

A patriarch in the imperial city who switched sides—and finally was condemned—at a time of heated Christological debate caused major repercussions on both sides. The sources are therefore extremely divided about how to judge Anthimus. On the one hand, the acts of the council of 536 survive and give scholars a very good, if biased, inside view of what happened before Anthimus was condemned.[11] For the non-Chalcedonians on the other hand, Anthimus became one of their patriarchs 'who distinguished themselves in exile in the time of the persecution'.[12] It is necessary to disentangle the historical person Anthimus from the divided commemoration by Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

When Anthimus already lived in Constantinople, but 'had not yet assumed the archepiscopal dignities of it', Ephrem of Amida sent him a letter concerning the two natures of Christ and the heresy of Eutyches.[13] He reminded Anthimus of the importance of the Council of Chalcedon as this was the only council that condemned Eutyches and his doctrines. The matter of Eutyches appears once more in a letter by Ephrem which the patriarch of Antioch wrote in reply to Anthimus' synodical letter as patriarch of Constantinople. Ephrem accepted the synodical letter but asked Anthimus to be more 'detailed and precise' concerning Eutyches and Eutychian doctrine.[14] What should scholars think of Anthimus? Was he a Chalcedonian patriarch or a non-Chalcedonian or even a crypto-Eutychian? Unfortunately, Photius in his *Bibliotheca* did not quote Ephrem's letter at length, but the acts of the council can help scholars to understand the patriarch.

[10] For the date see *Coll. Avell.* 90. For the story that he returned his pall to Justinian see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 19, 686. Here it is implied that he felt free after stepping back from his office to start communion with the non-Chalcedonians by sending letters to their patriarchs. See also below.

[11] *ACO* III, 126–86. See Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536', *passim.*

[12] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 19, 684–90.

[13] Photius, *Bibliotheca* 228, 247b–248a; Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. and trans. R. Henry, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1965, 121f.

[14] Photius, *Bibliotheca* 228, 247a; Henry, 119f.

He was negligent after a short while, he intimated such a destruction pretending that he was accepting the holy councils, that is the one in Nicaea against Arius, the one in Constantinople against Macedonius, the first one in Ephesus against Nestorius and the one in Chalcedon against Eutyches, which are even in the holy diptychs. The memory of the most blessed Pope Leo was also with them [the councils in the diptychs].[15]

Leaving the accusation of his negligence aside, the acts of the council corroborate the fact that Anthimus was elected as a Chalcedonian patriarch. He accepted Chalcedon and allowed the four councils and the name of Leo to remain in the diptychs. No non-Chalcedonianism can be detected so far, but Anthimus' Chalcedonian persuasion at the time of his election makes clear who promoted him to this office. Because of her assumed non-Chalcedonianism, scholars usually want to see here the influence of Theodora, who presumably persuaded her husband to choose a non-Chalcedonian patriarch for Constantinople. It is assumed that Anthimus was 'Theodora's man', and 535–6 marked the highpoint of Theodora's influence.[16] Scholars base their assumption on Victor of Tunnuna's note that Theodora intervened for Anthimus, and on the fact that Theodora took care of Anthimus after his condemnation.[17] But why should a presumably ardent non-Chalcedonian empress choose a patriarch who neither changed the diptychs nor did anything else in favour of the non-Chalcedonians?

Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor noted regarding Anthimus that 'being a man of virtuous character and known to the king [Justinian] and magnates for his chastity, he was appointed patriarch'.[18] Although both authors, Ps.-Zachariah and Victor, wrote more than thirty years after the events, Ps.-Zachariah is probably more reliable and he did not know of any intervention of Theodora.[19] Anthimus was an 'outsider'

[15] *ACO* III, 178.31–179.1.

[16] See the section on Theodora below.

[17] Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronicle* 537 (Vittore da Tunnuna, *Chronica. Chiesa e Impero nell' età di Giustiniano*, ed. and trans. A. Plancanica, Florence: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzi 1997, 40f.). Theodora's care for Anthimus: John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 19, 685f.

[18] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 135 (Brooks, 93; Hamilton and Brooks, 265).

[19] Victor of Tununna's *chronicle* even once received the scholarly verdict of being the 'worst chronicle of its time'; see O. Holder-Egger, 'Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts', *NA* 1 (1876), 213–368, here 298.

and certainly not the candidate of the Constantinopolitan clergy as Eduard Schwartz already noted.[20] This leads to the conclusion that Anthimus was Justinian's choice—a conclusion which the *Liber Pontificalis* and especially Justinian himself support.

The *Liber Pontificalis* is in its surviving form a ninth-century compilation that commemorates the popes beginning with Peter.[21] It notes for Pope Agapetus a heated discussion between Agapetus and Justinian about Anthimus, whom the pope regarded as a heretic whereas Justinian did not want to remove him from office.[22] Although this account was written only a couple of years after the event, it is unlikely that this dialogue ever happened as described.[23] Its author probably intended more to point out Agapetus' *parrhesia* before the emperor than Justinian's unwillingness to condemn Anthimus—which then would also indicate the emperor's original support of the controversial patriarch.

However, Justinian's original support becomes obvious in a letter, in which the emperor confirmed the decisions of the council of 536 to condemn Anthimus, Severus, Peter of Apamea, and the former stylite Zooras: Justinian makes the remarkable statement about Anthimus that the patriarch went astray 'believing that it is in the same way and equally necessary to lead the ones who are condemned and the ones who condemned'.[24] In other words, although condemning him as a heretic, Justinian credited his former patriarch for ecumenical efforts in attempting to bring together non-Chalcedonians—the ones who were condemned—and Chalcedonians—the ones who condemned. Considering Justinian's policy of rapprochement in the early 530s, there can be no reasonable doubt that Justinian was behind Anthimus' election.

But the patriarch's role in Justinian ecclesiastical policy was also a major force behind Anthimus' subsequent misfortune. The time was hardly ripe for an ecumenical patriarch. Anthimus almost immediately

[20] Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', 40f.

[21] *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum*, Mommsen (*The Book of Pontiffs*, Davis).

[22] *Liber Pontificalis* 59; *Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum*, Mommsen, 142f. (*The Book of Pontiffs*, Davis, 54f.).

[23] For the date see *The Book of Pontiffs*, Davis, Introduction. For the questionable authenticity of the account see E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums. Von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, vol. ii, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1933, 226, and Ensslin, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', 461f.

[24] *ACO* III, 120.20f. See Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536', 130.

fell victim to the, by then, well-established boundaries between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. In order to understand what he actually did as patriarch and what caused his condemnation, it is again necessary to quote from the acts of the Council of 536:

> And still he [Anthimus] slandered the phrase 'in two natures', the very thing which the holy council in Chalcedon had ruled against Eutyches especially. He [Anthimus] absolutely denied [using] this phrase, and he begged that those who were rightly condemned by the same holy council [of Chalcedon] be returned [into the church]. Therefore to the contrary he embraced them and he was zealous to show Dioscorus and the same Eutyches to be completely guiltless of the ill-repute for which they were captured.[25]

As the council was convened to condemn Anthimus and not to give him a fair trial, each accusation brought forth here must be weighed in its own right. The fact that he 'slandered' the phrase 'in two natures' did not make him automatically a non-Chalcedonian. The person who had summoned Anthimus to the council and accused him was the pope. The perspective given here on the dyophysite Christology reflects the papal position, which was not universally shared by eastern Chalcedonians.[26] Anthimus was probably a strict Cyrillian who did not support the *Tome* of Leo (even though he allowed the name of Leo to be in the diptychs). The passage rather demonstrates the problematic legacy of Chalcedon (which claimed that the Christology of Leo and Cyril were compatible) than a change of Anthimus' heart during his tenure as patriarch.

The second accusation of bringing back heretics into the church corroborates Justinian's statement of Anthimus' ecumenical efforts. These so-called heretics were Eutyches and Dioscorus, although Chalcedon had not condemned Dioscorus as a heretic.[27] It can be ruled out that Anthimus defended Eutyches since he explicitly condemned Eutyches in a synodical letter to Severus which he wrote when he was still patriarch.[28]

[25] *ACO* III, 179.26–31.

[26] Agapetus died 22 April 536 before the council started, but he took charge to organize the council and was therefore also credited in this passage for being 'paternally zealous' and summoning Anthimus 'under much sweat'. See also below.

[27] See Chapter 2.

[28] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.21, Brooks, 145 (Brooks, 99; Hamilton and Brooks, 275). For the date see E. Stein 'Cyrille de Scythopolis. À propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres', *AnBoll* 62 (1944), 183f.

Therefore the actual accusation must have been based on Anthimus' defence of Dioscorus. According to the *libellus* and the papal interpretation of Chalcedon, Dioscorus was a heretic as much as Eutyches. Because Dioscorus had accepted Eutyches at the Council of Ephesus II in 449, without having Eutyches' orthodoxy confirmed first, the Chalcedonians paired the two and made them appear both as condemned heretics. This perception might have been shared by eastern Chalcedonians as well, either deliberately or because the information of Dioscorus' deposition had been conflated with an alleged condemnation for heresy.

It cannot be doubted that every Chalcedonian expected Anthimus to condemn Dioscorus in his inaugural patriarchal address and in his synodical letters together with the usual heretics Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, etc.[29] Especially at this time, when non-Chalcedonians gained strength in the first half of the 530s, any step away from the *libellus* must have alarmed every Chalcedonian—even if Chalcedonian bishops had not denied Dioscorus' orthodoxy behind closed doors.[30] Considering how quickly Anthimus stirred up Chalcedonian clergy against himself, it must have been the missing condemnation of Dioscorus at the beginning of his tenure which incurred the Chalcedonian opposition. Ephrem of Amida's reply to Anthimus' synodical letters also points in the same direction. Ephrem's note that Anthimus should describe in more detail his anathema against Eutyches and 'Eutychian doctrines' probably did not refer directly to Eutyches—whom Anthimus obviously also condemned in his synodical letter to Ephrem—but to Dioscorus. In the Chalcedonian understanding the two were not only paired, but Dioscorus was also regarded as a Eutychian like all non-Chalcedonians.[31]

Anthimus knew at least since the debate of 532/3 that Chalcedon had not condemned Dioscorus for heresy. Here he also learned that the emperor requested the Council of Chalcedon to be accepted as a disciplinary council, not for its definition of faith, but 'as far as the

[29] See Severus' address after his election as patriarch of Antioch, in which he condemned the usual heretics: 'Allocution prononcée par Sévère après son élévation sur le trône d'Antioche', ed. and trans. M.-A. Kugener, *OrChr* 2 (1902), 265–82.

[30] See Chapter 2 for the debate of 532/3.

[31] Although the non-Chalcedonians had condemned Eutyches as well, and they immediately tried to disassociate themselves from Eutyches in the debates of 532/3.

expulsion of Eutyches was concerned'.[32] It seems that this was not only Justinian's but also Anthimus' position and induced the emperor to choose the bishop of Trebizond to be the patriarch of the capital.

Once Anthimus omitted Dioscorus from the list of heretics, he resurrected an archenemy of the Chalcedonians, thereby implicitly questioning the authority of the papal *libellus*. As a result he lost all support among the Constantinopolitan Chalcedonian clergy. They might have been suspicious of him anyway because Justinian put an outsider at the top of their hierarchy. All eyes focused on him, and the situation probably became unmanageable for the ascetic who used to live a quiet and undisturbed life. The fact that he embraced communion with Severus and Theodosius so soon must have been a consequence of the harassment by zealous Chalcedonians who did not accept his perception of Dioscorus.[33] He stepped down from his office quickly due to Agapetus' unexpected arrival and the pope's stubborn refusal to take communion with him. Any day he would have prolonged his tenure as patriarch would have made the situation more unbearable, for him as well as for his patron Justinian.

Whether or not Anthimus accepted Chalcedon as a disciplinary council might have made less difference to him than to modern historians who place him first on the side of the Chalcedonians and later on the side of the non-Chalcedonians. Theologically he probably remained a Cyrillian who had no use for the *Tome* of Leo even before he joined the ranks of the non-Chalcedonians and condemned Leo's writings.[34]

The personality of Severus may have facilitated Anthimus' decision because he admired the former patriarch of Antioch, a fellow ascetic, as a confessor and faithful Christian in exile 'who in our times has undergone such a contest, removing from place to place [. . .] And in

[32] Brock, 'The Conversations', 116.

[33] That Dioscorus' condemnation was still under debate and the official declaration of him being a heretic hardly shared by all Christians in the East (especially in Egypt) is corroborated by Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronicle* 541, Plancanica, 44f., who accredits the downfall of Paul, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria (537–40), to the patriarch's commemoration of Dioscorus.

[34] According to the synodical letters preserved by Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, Severus and Anthimus shared the same theology; Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.21–6, Brooks, 141–73 (Brooks, 96–117; Hamilton and Brooks, 271–95).

you I see the doctors of the Church, because you have duly set the lamp visibly on a stand, shining, as you do, in deed and word.'[35] Severus' endurance for his faith probably impressed Anthimus more than the Constantinopolitan clergy and court theologians. These were keener to uphold their definition of an orthodox past than to accept that Dioscorus could be regarded as orthodox.

Anthimus did not make his communion with Severus public, but wrote the letter in 'secret' and 'under the fear of the Jews' while Severus was in Constantinople and Theodosius in Alexandria.[36] This corroborates the evidence that depicts Anthimus as a solitary ascetic bound by his personal persuasions, a man wedged between religious trenches: he wished neither to put himself in the frontline of the non-Chalcedonian cause by publicizing his support for the non-Chalcedonians nor to embarrass Justinian even more by revealing that his patriarch sided with the non-Chalcedonians.[37]

According to John of Ephesus, Anthimus was eager to return the episcopal pall and return to his former life as ascetic. If the Chalcedonian church historian Evagrius is correct, Severus might have even seconded the pope in his request that Anthimus should step down from his office, maybe because he also regarded the uncanonical election as an obstacle. More likely, however, Severus knew the true reason behind the pretext of the uncanonical election. Therefore, he advised Anthimus to step down because Severus feared that the Chalcedonians would force Anthimus to condemn Dioscorus and thereby to compromise his faith. If Anthimus had given a condemnation of Dioscorus, no one would have questioned his uncanonical election.

At this time the Chalcedonians did not yet know Anthimus' synodal letters to Severus and Theodosius because some of them still believed that Anthimus could return to his bishopric in Trebizond as soon as he handed in a *libellus* by which he would prove his

[35] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.21, Brooks, 146 (Brooks, 100; Hamilton and Brooks, 275f.).

[36] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.23, Brooks, 156f. (Brooks, 106f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 282). By then he certainly also had personal contact with Severus in Constantinople, but John of Beth Aphtonia, *Life of Severus*, 253–6, probably exaggerates, stating that Severus converted Anthimus.

[37] Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', 40, believed quite the opposite: 'der unbedeutende, charakterlose Mann [Anthimus] unterlag der Überredungskunst des Severus sofort'.

orthodox (Chalcedonian) faith.[38] But the recent developments in Constantinople had threatened the position of the Chalcedonians, and they took the chance to change religious policy in their favour. Pope Agapetus consecrated the Constantinopolitan cleric Menas patriarch of Constantinople on 13 March 536 and summoned a council for May/June 536. Unfortunately for the pope he could neither preside over the council nor see its outcome, which certainly would have pleased him. He died unexpectedly on 22 April 536. Menas, the first patriarch of Constantinople ordained by a pope—as Agapetus proudly announced in a letter to Peter of Jerusalem—took over his seat.[39] The new patriarch referred at the opening of the council to Agapetus' synodical letter that summoned the council and thereby tried to legitimize the council as truly ecumenical.[40] Not surprisingly, the council first of all condemned Anthimus, and two weeks later convened again to condemn Severus, Peter of Apamea, and the stylite Zooras.[41] Chalcedonian monks requested that the emperor issue laws against the heretics and seize the property of persons who allowed heretics to assemble or administer the sacraments on their property.[42] This led to Justinian's *Novella* 42 of 8 August 536, in which he confirmed the council and condemned the aforementioned non-Chalcedonians and their writings.[43]

The policy of rapprochement had failed and the emperor appears unprepared for the rapid sequence of events. At the beginning of March he had in Anthimus a patriarch with whom he shared the same vision of a church of the empire, and in Severus an opponent who had finally agreed to pay the emperor a visit and discuss the divisions within the church. Less than two weeks later the pope had destroyed Justinian's hard work of several years, forced Anthimus to resign from office and ordained a new patriarch who envisioned a distinctively Chalcedonian church in the empire. Justinian reacted

[38] Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536', 112.

[39] Ensslin, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', 462; Hofmann, 'Der hl. Papst Agapit I. und die Kirche von Byzanz', 123.

[40] Menas, however, did not include this letter in the acts of the council; Ensslin, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', 465.

[41] For a detailed analysis see Speigl, 'Die Synode von 536', 121–42.

[42] *ACO* III, 38–52.

[43] *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. iii: *Novellae*, ed. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, Berlin: Weidmann 1904, 263–9.

frantically. Only one day after the ordination of Menas, Justinian requested that the pope would at least agree to his theopaschite edict of 533 as Pope John II had done. Two days later Justinian had not heard back from the pope and apparently felt compelled to renew the *libellus*, and sent it to Agapetus. The pope answered in a very reconciliatory tone on 18 March and agreed with the emperor's definitions of faith. Agapetus had accomplished more in ten days than he could ever have hoped for, and he wisely decided to grant Justinian this wish. It would have been difficult for Agapetus to question the theopaschite edict anyway because his predecessor John II had agreed to it—as Agapetus noted in his reply to Justinian.[44] Retracting doctrinal decisions of one's predecessors would hardly fit the image popes had worked so hard to establish—not the least in the *libellus*:[45] the unquestionable doctrinal authority of the papacy, blameless since the time of the apostles.[46]

It is ironic how a situation which possibly could have brought Justinian a tremendous victory actually produced such a serious defeat. The emperor had worked for a policy of rapprochement for years, and even though a unity of the church had not yet been in the air, he had gained control over the disunity and could hope to achieve even more with a loyal patriarch in the capital. An unforeseeable incident, the fact that the Ostrogoth king believed the pope to be the best ambassador, and a minor mistake, Anthimus' uncanonical election, in combination caused Justinian's vision to collapse. The papacy resolutely stopped the emperor's policy of rapprochement.[47]

As a result, 536 is sometimes regarded as the year of the definite split of the non-Chalcedonians.[48] Although it is true that non-Chalcedonianism was condemned and never legalized again,

[44] *Coll. Avell.* 91.

[45] See Chapter 2.

[46] Therefore Pope Vigilius' (537–55) condemnation of the Three Chapters found very strong resistance in the West as this condemnation could hardly be reconciled with Pope Leo's role (and teaching) at the Council of Chalcedon. See general Conclusion.

[47] Obviously, it remains speculative whether Justinian's policy could have been crowned with success or whether the eastern Chalcedonians would have been able to remove Anthimus at some point and place a candidate of their choice on the patriarchal throne of the capital.

[48] Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 46–8.

some of the non-Chalcedonians might have still hoped for a change. Non-Chalcedonianism was alive and thriving, and Justinian could not rule without its adherents. The emperor even supported John of Ephesus' and his colleagues' missionary activities in Asia Minor to convert pagans some time after 542.[49]

Anthimus had agreed to become patriarch at the emperor's request, but he was placed in an exposed position where he hardly felt comfortable. He took his personal stand in the religious controversy, but he could not or was not willing to persuade or subdue others to his position. For Anthimus, 535/6 was only a short interlude in his life as an ascetic, but in the commemoration of him these months grew in importance. The Greek Orthodox tradition preserves fragments of his writings as writings of a 'monophysite'.[50] For the Greek Orthodox he was not only a heretic, but a traitor. John of Ephesus, on the other hand, integrated him among 'the five blessed patriarchs', but Anthimus remains unusual in John of Ephesus' collection. Contrary to the other non-Chalcedonian patriarchs in this collection, Severus, Theodosius, Sergius, and Paul, Anthimus never shepherded any non-Chalcedonian communities as patriarch. He never had any actual contact with non-Chalcedonian communities, neither before he became patriarch nor afterwards. Anthimus lived quietly and peacefully in Theodora's palace after his condemnation, and his life after 536 probably did not differ from his life as a solitary before he became patriarch. No one knew about his whereabouts and probably no one cared because Anthimus did not take part in any further religious quarrels.[51]

For John, Anthimus became a special saint because he 'realized the evil of Chalcedon and then changed his mind', in other words, he converted and embraced non-Chalcedonianism.[52] John also prolonged Anthimus' tenure to 'a considerable number of years' and

[49] Michael Whitby, 'John of Ephesus and the Pagans: Pagan Survivals in the Sixth Century', in *Paganism in the Later Roman Empire and in Byzantium*, ed. Maciej Salamon, Cracow: Universitas 1991, 111–31; see general Conclusion.

[50] Honigmann, 'Anthimus of Trebizond', in *idem*, *Patristic Studies*, 189–91.

[51] He probably wrote his address to Justinian when he became patriarch, although the text is not dated. For the Syriac version see *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, ed. and trans. A. van Roey and P. Allen, Leuven: Peeters/Departement Orientalistiek 1994, 61–4 (there see also the references to the Greek fragments); for the date see also Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 44–6.

[52] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 19, 684–90.

remembered him for his uncompromising character as a non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople against the reigning Chalcedonians. John's account may also resonate with hope that some day Anthimus might find a successor who would also convert and stay long enough in power to change the religious policy in Constantinople.

REMEMBERING THEODORA: A 'BELIEVING QUEEN'?

Introduction

The other person who raised non-Chalcedonian hopes for a religious change in Constantinople was Justinian's wife, Theodora. Theodora's role is therefore not only important for the understanding of the religious policy in Byzantium, but also for the self-understanding of the evolving Syrian Orthodox Church. Being a non-Chalcedonian empress in public since 535/6, Theodora was the perfect example for John of Ephesus' desire to demonstrate that non-Chalcedonianism was still presentable at court even though a council had condemned it. John of Ephesus used his loving memory of her to illustrate that the non-Chalcedonian faith could have the potential to rule Byzantium instead of the Chalcedonian church. Based on a solid chronology for the religious policy as established in the previous chapters, the image of Theodora as the 'believing queen' and ardent non-Chalcedonian who promoted the non-Chalcedonian cause will be questioned here.[53]

The sources for Theodora challenge the historian—not only because of biased ancient authors, but also because it seems that the imperial couple deliberately attempted to conceal their intentions.

[53] For the image of the 'believing Queen' see especially S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'Theodora the "Believing Queen": A Study in Syriac Historiographical Tradition', *Hugoye* 4.2 (2001) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol4No2/HV4N2Harvey.html], pars. 1–31; see also Ashbrook Harvey's account of Theodora in *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and* The Lives of the Eastern Saints, Berkeley: University of California Press 1990, 80–91. John of Ephesus often calls her the 'believing queen', Severus once the 'Christ-loving queen'.

The usually well-informed Evagrius remarks that he did not know whether the imperial couple was indeed divided over the nature of Christ or whether they had a silent agreement that one should favour the Chalcedonians, the other the non-Chalcedonians.[54] Procopius in his *Anecdota*, an invective on the reign of Justinian and Theodora, corroborates Evagrius' latter thought, but added the false accusation that the imperial couple thereby divided Christianity.[55] Through his *Anecdota*, in which Procopius describes colourfully Theodora's early career as actress and courtesan, he has intentionally distorted Theodora's memory. As Clive Foss points out, every scholar relies partially on Procopius' account because the additional material on her remains meagre.[56] Fortunately, her involvement in religious affairs is the one area for which additional accounts from non-Chalcedonian authors survive.

Since it is generally presumed that she was an ardent non-Chalcedonian, some scholars believe that an actual opposition between her and her husband existed. Concerning Anthimus' installation in Constantinople and Theodosius' in Alexandria William Frend believed—like Eduard Schwartz before him—that the 'years 535–6 were to test the reality of the empress' powers to dominate the religious situation in the empire', and the 'coup' to install Anthimus 'marks the highwater-mark of her influence'.[57] Although scholars still maintain the religious division of the imperial couple, they prefer now to see in it clever policy rather than real opposition. In the words of J. A. S. Evans:

[54] Evagrius, *HE* IV.10, Bidez and Parmentier, 160 (Whitby, 209).

[55] Procopius, *Anecdota* X.15; ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 290, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1935, 126f. For Procopius and Theodora see Av. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London: Duckworth 1985, 53, 55, 67–83; A. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, History, and Philosophy at the End of Antiquity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2004, criticizes Cameron's work and claims to restore Procopius to his proper context. Kaldellis, however, differs in scope from Cameron's work and does not discuss Theodora's religious affiliation or the imperial couple's religious policy.

[56] C. Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', *Byz.* 72 (2002), 141–76; in the first part of this article Foss collects the sources besides the *Anecdota* and concludes what image of Theodora would have come down to us were it not for Procopius.

[57] W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972, 270f. Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', 40–5. Similarly Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 145.

'As long as the Monophysites had a friend in court, they continued to owe their allegiance to the empire.'[58] Foss' statement that 'it suited him [Justinian] to find an unofficial way to placate the followers of a religion that was dominant in his richest provinces' goes in the same direction.[59] It can hardly be doubted that having Theodora as protector of the non-Chalcedonians was a convenient arrangement for a Chalcedonian emperor.

Theodora's unofficial character and status as protector explains why ancient authors were unsure if she really gave orders in favour of non-Chalcedonians or whether it only looked in public as if she was behind decisions in favour of the non-Chalcedonians.[60] It might have been risky even for an empress to be involved with 'heretics', but she also honoured Chalcedonian saints like Sabas when he came to Constantinople.[61] She took care of the poor in the city as well as of strangers who came to Constantinople, and probably regardless of their faith.[62]

Although believing in an arrangement of the imperial couple for the protection of non-Chalcedonians, scholars still generally assume Theodora to have been an ardent non-Chalcedonian. By analysing Procopius' biased account and the possible opposition between Justinian and Theodora regarding religious policy, scholars have not paid enough attention to the non-Chalcedonian texts and the possibility of opposition between the non-Chalcedonians and Theodora.

[58] J. A. S. Evans, *The Empress Theodora: Partner of Justinian*, Austin: University of Texas Press 2002, 24.

[59] C. Foss, 'Theodora and Evita: Two Women in Power', in *Novum Millenium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. C. Sode and S. Takács, Aldershot: Ashgate 2001, 120.

[60] The installing of Anthimus as patriarch is an example; see discussion above. Also in the case of Theodosius of Alexandria it was probably Justinian who made the final decision; see Chapter 4.

Recently Hartmut Leppin has stressed that Theodora's position at the side of Justinian was not beyond average for an empress: H. Leppin, 'Kaiserliche Kohabitation: Von der Normalität Theodoras', in *Grenzen der Macht. Zur Rolle der römischen Kaiserfrauen*, ed. C. Kunst und U. Riemer, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2000, 75–85; concerning Theodora's religious policy, however, he merely recounts well established paths of scholarship. Her 'limitations [...] within a traditional society' have already been stressed by Cameron, *Procopius*, 78.

[61] Sabas' rude behaviour towards her may be a later embellishment by Cyril of Scythopolis after Theodora's death. See below.

[62] Evagrius, *HE* IV.10, Bidez and Parmentier, 160 (Whitby, 209).

That is not to say that scholars should question Procopius' story of Theodora's youth as actress or prostitute in favour of the medieval non-Chalcedonian accounts that the future empress had been the daughter of a non-Chalcedonian priest.[63] But scholars often go along with John of Ephesus' praise regarding her religious policy and believe her to be a faithful promoter of the non-Chalcedonian cause throughout her life.

The chronology as established here does not support an alleged non-Chalcedonianism before the mid-530s. Furthermore, it is not as J. A. S. Evans rashly assumes that 'Theodora served His Majesty's loyal opposition'.[64] Theodora worked as a protector for the non-Chalcedonians from the mid-530s until her death, but not as their promoter. She and her husband had the same agenda, but this agenda differed from that of the non-Chalcedonians.

An Unusual Career: from Prostitute to Empress

Almost everything about Theodora's childhood and early career before she became empress in 527 comes from Procopius' *Anecdota*.[65] Born in Constantinople as the daughter of an artisan, her life was destined for the stage. Procopius' moral indignation at Theodora's lascivious conduct cannot conceal the fact that this lifestyle had not been her choice, but was part of her profession which she could not leave. At some point, perhaps about 518, she became the courtesan of Hecebolus when he took up office as governor of Libya Pentapolis.[66] This arrangement did not work out, and she left for Constantinople. According to Procopius she made her way

[63] *Chronicon anonymum ad* A.D. 819 pertinens 55, in *Chronicon (Anonymum) ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, ed. and trans. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 81/109, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq 1920/1937, 192 (151); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.20 and XI.5; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901, 277 (189) and 414f. (419f.); Harvey, 'Theodora the "Believing Queen"', par. 9.

[64] Evans, *The Empress Theodora*, 27.

[65] B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, Berlin: de Gruyter 1960, 98–107, and H.-G. Beck, *Kaiserin Theodora und Prokop. Der Historiker und sein Opfer*, Munich and Zurich: Piper 1986, 89–98, provide a good and balanced interpretation of Theodora's youth based on Procopius.

[66] *PLRE* 528.

through the eastern provinces as a prostitute or actress. At some point she must have repented her former profession in order to be suitable to marry Justinian. No source remembers whether this conversion took place before she met Justinian in Constantinople or after they already knew each other.[67]

Sometimes it is claimed that the empress had a conversion on her way back from Libya to Constantinople in Alexandria, where she would have been in contact with Severus of Antioch and Timothy of Alexandria.[68] By propagating the seductive and influential image of a penitent harlot it would be possible to explain the apparent dissent between Justinian and Theodora concerning Christological issues as the logical consequence of Theodora's sinful youth and the following conversion at the hand of a non-Chalcedonian patriarch in an area where non-Chalcedonianism was particularly strong.[69] But no contact with Severus can be verified in the sources, and the seventh-century note of the Coptic bishop John of Nikiu that Theodora considered Timothy as her spiritual father is hardly anything more than a non-Chalcedonian legend.[70]

In Constantinople, Theodora was quickly elevated to the rank of a patrician, but Justin's wife Euphemia did not want the two to marry. Only after her death in 523 did Justin allow a change of the law so that former actresses who were already elevated to patrician rank could marry into the aristocracy.[71] Justin made the law for Justinian and Theodora, and they probably married soon afterwards.

[67] Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 168, thinks that she was first Justinian's mistress, which is very likely.

[68] For the claim that Severus had been her spiritual instructor see Harvey, 'Theodora the "Believing Queen"', par. 7. For Timothy see below n. 70.

[69] For the image of the penitent harlot see L. L. Coon, *Sacred Fictions: Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1997, 71–94. Cameron, *Procopius*, 77, rightly states that 'Theodora herself underlined it [her past] with her foundation for reformed prostitutes.'

[70] The story claims that Justinian tried to replace all non-Chalcedonian patriarchs with Chalcedonian patriarchs and only spared Timothy IV because of Theodora's intercession as she acknowledged Timothy as her spiritual father; this is impossible as Justin replaced only Severus of Antioch in 518/19 and had no intention of removing Timothy in Alexandria (and at that point Theodora had not even met Justinian); John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* XC.87 (*The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.) Coptic Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. R. H. Charles, Text and Translation Society 3, London 1916, 144). Already Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 167, regards this source as 'worthless'.

[71] For the legal issues see the detailed analysis of D. Daube, 'The Marriage of Justinian and Theodora: Legal and Theological Reflections', *CULR* 16 (1968), 380–99.

Theodora must have given birth to at least one son, John, and an anonymous daughter before she met Justinian (not considering the many abortions that Procopius notes).[72] Two of Theodora's grandsons, the sons of her daughter, adhered to the non-Chalcedonian persuasion, and one of them, the monk Athanasius, was even taken into consideration as a candidate for the vacant patriarchal see of Alexandria in 566.[73] However, this does not necessarily mean that Theodora had been married to a non-Chalcedonian before she met Justinian as Foss thinks, or that she or the father of her daughter had been non-Chalcedonians.[74]

No facts survive concerning Theodora's religious beliefs in her early career. Scholars employ an anecdote by John of Ephesus to illustrate Theodora's non-Chalcedonian persuasion before she became empress: John of Ephesus noted in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* that the deacon Stephen went to Theodora in 524–7 in order to intercede on behalf of the expelled non-Chalcedonian metropolitan Mara who lived in exile in Petra.[75] According to John, Stephen went to Theodora not because she was a non-Chalcedonian or a protector of non-Chalcedonians, but because God directed him there. Theodora, who 'learned of that distress, as if by divine instigation, because she saw that saint's [Mara's] distress, made her mercy manifest' by asking her husband under tears to intercede for Mara. Mara and another non-Chalcedonian bishop were then allowed to leave their exile in Petra for Alexandria.

If taken at face value, the story would show that Theodora's alleged non-Chalcedonianism was not even known in non-Chalcedonian circles at this time. This would make it extremely difficult to offer an historical explanation why the deacon Stephen went straight to her. However, John recounts the story in another version in the second part of his *Church History.* Here he also remarks that Theodora interceded for Mara, but this time the episode takes place after Justinian had become emperor and Theodora empress.[76] Later in the

[72] Evans, *The Empress Theodora*, 16, believes that the son was 'an impostor, if he existed at all'. For Theodora's offspring see also Cameron, *Procopius*, 80f.

[73] *PLRE* III, Athanasius 5, 147.

[74] Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 143.

[75] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 13, in *PO* 17, 189.

[76] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 32 (Harrak, 60). It is surprising that scholars have not noted the chronological inconsistencies in the

530s, perhaps 538, Theodora interceded on behalf of the deceased Mara so that non-Chalcedonians were permitted to translate Mara's corpse from Alexandria to Amida.[77]

How may these two events around Mara, his move from Petra to Alexandria and the translation of his corpse, as well as the commemoration of these events be understood? As will be analysed below, there can be no doubt that Theodora was regarded as a non-Chalcedonian empress in 538, the possible date for Mara's death.[78] Therefore, at this point in 538, it is highly likely that she was approached by non-Chalcedonians concerning the translation of Mara's corpse to Amida. She could easily intercede in this case because the permit given by the emperor showed the goodwill of the court to allow non-Chalcedonians to honour their venerated dead. But on the other hand, the permit did not touch on the religious policy in general. Thus far, John of Ephesus can be trusted.

Concerning Mara's switches of location for exile, two issues need to be discussed separately: when did it happen and how much credit must be given to Theodora for interceding? John's story in the *Lives of the Eastern Saints* appears to be an elaboration of the original, shorter note in his *Church History*.[79] If Theodora was not known to

texts, but only quote the first and perhaps fictitious anecdote; see for example L. Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium* AD 527–1204, London and New York: Routledge 1999, 23; Harvey, 'Theodora the "Believing Queen"', par. 19; and Evans, *The Empress Theodora*, 19.

[77] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 13, in *PO* 17, 194f.: 'After a space of eight years the holy bishop Mare departed from the body in Alexandria', which probably means that he died after he had lived in Alexandria for *another* eight years. If the above outlined conclusions are correct he died around 538 like John of Tella and Severus of Antioch (and not as Brooks noted in 529).

[78] For Mara see previous footnote, for Theodora see below the section 'The Non-Chalcedonian Empress'.

[79] It is, however, unknown when exactly John wrote the first parts of his *Church History*, but here I would argue that this part of the *Church History* was finished before he wrote his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* in 566/8 (S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'Johannes von Ephesus', *RAC* 18 (1997), 555). About the question whether Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor is dependent on John's *Church History* (and therefore John must have written it before 569 when Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor finished his account), or the other way around, or whether both relied on a common source, see G. Greatrex, 'Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene: The Context and Nature of his Work', *JCSSS* 6 (2006), 48 n. 15; see also J. Rist, 'Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor: Überlieferung, Inhalt und theologische Bedeutung', in M. Tamcke (ed.), *Syriaca. Zur Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen*, Münster: Lit 2002, 93.

be a non-Chalcedonian, there is no reason why Stephen should have contacted Theodora; this made John speak of a miraculous guidance by God. Considering Justinian's policy of rapprochement at the beginning of the 530s as discussed above, it is likely that Mara did not leave Petra before 530/1, at the same time that the other non-Chalcedonians also started to enjoy more freedom. This leads to the question of Theodora's involvement in interceding for Mara.

John also credits Theodora for persuading her husband to allow the monks to return to their monasteries around 530/1. However, the more reliable Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor sees here the emperor's initiative.[80] It might be that Ps.-Zachariah omitted her by accident, but John of Ephesus' account remains suspicious: Theodora did not act in any way publicly, but John believes that she persuaded her husband. However, the secret persuasion might be something that John only assumed because of her later work for the non-Chalcedonians or because (later) rumours spread that she was responsible for her husband's change of heart.

A similar development can be assumed for John of Ephesus' accounts concerning Theodora's intercessions on Mara's behalf. She certainly interceded in 538, but John might have heard rumours, or assumed or deliberately postulated that she had already interceded for Mara earlier. In the *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, John even went so far as to transform the non-Chalcedonian empress into a non-Chalcedonian benefactor before her accession to the throne. The further away from the event, the greater Theodora's work for the non-Chalcedonians became in John' commemoration.

Outside John of Ephesus' works, Theodora's invisibility in religious activities in the early years of Justinian's reign is striking. She neither invited the non-Chalcedonian bishops for the debate in 532/3 nor did she appear at all in the surviving records of this debate.[81] This

[80] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 82 (Brooks, 56; Hamilton and Brooks, 212). See also Chapter 3.

[81] In the 'plerophoria' of the non-Chalcedonian bishops, the bishops only speak of Justinian's letters. The bishops did, however, speak of Theodora as the 'God-loving queen', but they also call Justinian a 'believing' emperor, the very same word Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor also used for the non-Chalcedonian bishops and monks, and John of Ephesus for Theodora. It can therefore not be concluded from this letter to Justinian that the non-Chalcedonian bishops regarded Theodora as a non-Chalcedonian empress at this point.

indicates that she did not play a role at all, as the documentation of the debate—surviving in both the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian tradition—is unparalleled and furthermore contemporary, unlike accounts written thirty or forty years later by historians reflecting on the reign of Justinian and Theodora.[82]

The non-Chalcedonian bishops stayed in Constantinople for more than one year but nothing is said to suggest that they were Theodora's guests. It can be assumed that they were official guests of Justinian. Furthermore, Theodora apparently did not receive a statement of faith from the non-Chalcedonian bishops as Justinian did, even though the non-Chalcedonian bishops wrote this statement of faith while they were already in Constantinople.[83] They could and certainly would have drawn up a similar statement for Theodora, too, if they believed that the empress had a genuine interest for the non-Chalcedonians.

For this important debate the sources account for every influential person involved in religious policy—except for Theodora. Neither did she send a confidant into the debate as did the patriarch of Constantinople (his *synkelloi* Heraclianus and Laurentius and the priest Eusebius), the emperor (the *Magistros* Strategius), the patriarch of Antioch (the priests, stewards, and *Apocrisarii* Hermisigenes, Magnus, and Aquilinus) and the patriarch of Jerusalem (the steward and monk Leontius) nor did she take part in the meetings between the emperor and the bishops.[84]

Neither the Chalcedonian nor the non-Chalcedonian sources saw her working behind the scenes or allegedly persuading her husband to do anything for the non-Chalcedonians. Apparently she did not care about the outcome. Her complete absence from the debate of 532/3 contradicts Theodora's image of being an ardent non-Chalcedonian.

After Justinian failed to reach a deal with the non-Chalcedonians in 532/3, and the non-Chalcedonians openly resisted his requests, it

[82] In addition to the sources laid out in Chapter 2, see also Elias, *Life of John of Tella*: he mentions that the imperial couple was eager to present gifts to John of Tella and the other bishops, but otherwise Theodora is absent from his account; Brooks, 59f. (Ghanem, 70).

[83] Brock, 'The Conversations', 92f.: the bishops wrote the 'plerophoria' after they went up to the capital.

[84] Innocentius 6; *ACO* IV.2, 170.1–6.

was high time for him to change his policy. Part of it included the transfer of the non-Chalcedonian problem to Constantinople. Since Justinian had not been able to persuade Severus to come to the debate in 532/3, he needed to convince him and other non-Chalcedonians who potentially might come to Constantinople that he would not harm them, but respect their persuasion. It seems that Theodora would be the logical person who could assist him in this. As Evans puts it: 'it was an advantage for an autocrat to have a secondary power center in the state so long as it was firmly in the hands of a loyal wife'.[85]

Since Theodora still had not played a role in 532/3, she had probably also not been involved in summoning Severus for the first time in 530/1. Although Evagrius knew of letters by Severus to Justinian and Theodora, this does not necessarily mean that Severus wrote to Theodora because she had written to him first or because she was known as an ardent non-Chalcedonian.[86] In 518, for example, Pope Hormisdas wrote several letters to different aristocrats at the court of Constantinople. By writing to Theodora, Severus only acknowledged her influence at court and on her husband. However, Theodora possibly wrote to him in 533 when Justinian tried to persuade Severus for the second time to come to Constantinople or Justinian made it clear to Severus that he would be under his wife's protection if he came to Constantinople. For Justinian the arrangement that his wife protected Severus in Constantinople must have been the optimal solution. Otherwise it would have been difficult for him to explain to his patriarch and Ephrem of Amida why he as Chalcedonian emperor protected their archenemy.

The first time that Theodora was publicly involved in religious affairs—and then on the side of the non-Chalcedonians—was 535/6 when Severus lodged in Constantinople. According to Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor and Evagrius she had persuaded her husband to summon Severus and receive him in a friendly manner. Ps.-Zachariah describes her—at this time, 535/6—as 'devoted to Severus' and according to John of Beth Aphtonia she introduced Anthimus to Severus. It was probably also around this time that Theodora set up her refugee

[85] Evans, *The Empress Theodora*, 27.

[86] Evagrius, *HE* IV.11, Bidez and Parmentier, 160f. (Whitby, 210).

camp in the palace of Hormisdas. After the fall of Anthimus, Justinian probably preferred to have the non-Chalcedonian ascetics off the streets in Constantinople and thought it appropriate to accommodate them in his old palace where he and Theodora could easily oversee and visit them.[87] Later in 536, Theodora helped Severus to escape and hid Anthimus in her palace where he was found after her death in 548.[88] Her involvement in the protection of Severus and Anthimus cannot be just rumour. It must be concluded that she was introduced to the public as non-Chalcedonian sometime after 532 and began to protect non-Chalcedonians since 535/6.

The question arises how the imperial couple could make such an arrangement without having people suspect them of staging it. First of all, not all sources believed that they were truly devoted to their respective religious policies. The claims of Procopius alone would probably not make a good case, but since Evagrius also came to the same conclusion that this might have been an arrangement, people at court or in Constantinople in general might have known.

Second, the uncertainty of Theodora's past prevented people from knowing for a fact that she had not been a devoted non-Chalcedonian in her youth. Foss has drawn a comparison between Theodora and Eva Perón, wife of the former Argentinian president Perón. Like Theodora, Eva was from humble origins and worked her way up to the highest power in the state by a career comparable to Theodora's. Once in power, details about Eva's early life vanished and were substituted by colourful—and contradictory—rumours.[89] Many of Procopius' anecdotes about Theodora's early life are rumours as well, and it is hardly doubtful that the imperial couple wished to suppress details of Theodora's past as soon as she reached Justinian's social status.[90] This situation gave room for a rewriting of the past.

[87] See also below.

[88] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.19, Brooks, 135 (Brooks, 93; Hamilton and Brooks, 265); Evagrius, *HE* IV.10, Bidez and Parmentier, 160 (Whitby, 209); John of Beth Aphtonia, *Vie de Sévère par Jean Supérieur du Monastère de Beith-Aphthonia*, M.-A. Kugener, in *PO* 2, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 253–7; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 19, 686f.

[89] Foss, 'Theodora and Evita: Two Women in Power', 113–21. The first to draw this parallel—without a scholarly approach—was L. Fischer-Pap, *Eva: Theodora. Evita Peron: Empress Theodora Reincarnated*, Rockford, Ill.: LFP 1982.

[90] Cameron, *Procopius*, 77f., remarks only that 'her past seems to have been irrelevant'.

The audience in the sixth century was not yet ready to see Theodora as the daughter of a non-Chalcedonian priest, as the Syrian Orthodox since the Middle Ages believed, but why not claim in the 530s that she was of non-Chalcedonian persuasion? It might have been pointed out that Theodora was inclined towards non-Chalcedonianism because she perhaps had a non-Chalcedonian conversion or maybe a non-Chalcedonian daughter.[91] Considering her past or maybe the suppression of it, and her new social status, no one would question the earnestness of her piety publicly. John of Ephesus mentioned that she was from a brothel, but remains otherwise silent about her early career. This indicates that he did not know anything good to say about her past. If the empress announced her non-Chalcedonian beliefs and offered her protection for non-Chalcedonian bishops and monks, John of Ephesus and other non-Chalcedonians hardly had any interest in spreading any gossip about her past or doubting the sincerity of Theodora's intentions to support them.

The Non-Chalcedonian Empress

Once Theodora embraced the role of a non-Chalcedonian empress, this public persona developed its own dynamic. She functioned as an intermediary at court as the condemned non-Chalcedonians could not officially approach Justinian, but any non-Chalcedonian seeking a favour or peoples requesting non-Chalcedonian missionaries came to her. The contacts between Theodora and non-Chalcedonians within and outside the empire, however, did not lead to a close personal spiritual relationship between the empress and any of the non-Chalcedonians.

Severus mentions her only twice in his letters.[92] His first note about her dates from 536 and credits Theodora, the 'Christ-loving

[91] Procopius either did not know anything about her conversion or omitted it because it did not fit his image of her; see Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 106f. The fact that Theodora's grandsons were non-Chalcedonians does not necessarily imply that her daughter was non-Chalcedonian, too.

[92] This, again, also speaks against a spiritual relationship between the two in Theodora's youth. It would be surprising if Severus would not make use of this relationship, as he was otherwise not shy about contacting high officials with whom he was acquainted or whom he hoped might help him or the non-Chalcedonian

queen', for providing him 'sufficient protection' when he was in Constantinople.[93] In another letter, addressed to Misael, a non-Chalcedonian *cubicularius* and later deacon with whom Severus was on good terms, Severus mentions that he wrote the empress a treatise 'on the question whether our Lord and God Jesus Christ should be said to be from two substances even as from two natures', but believed that 'she has also spurned and despised [it], as vain trifling and superfluous futility'.[94] Severus furthermore bitterly complains about Theodora, who 'presumes to say such grievous, not to say blasphemous, things against the holy fathers in respect of doctrines which she does not understand, and mocks at the holy Alexander the archbishop, who is one of the prelates of the holy synod at Nicaea'.[95] That Theodora 'was considered to take an intelligent interest' in the theological controversies, as Lynda Garland states, seems therefore highly doubtful.[96] On the contrary, considering how heavily sixth-century theologians relied on the patristic past for their Christological arguments, it is hard to imagine a harsher criticism than supposing that someone mocked the Nicene church fathers. If Severus believed Theodora to be a zealous non-Chalcedonian empress, he would have characterized her differently.

Several non-Chalcedonian bishops sent Theodora their works. But all the works addressed to her by the non-Chalcedonian bishops Severus, Theodosius of Alexandria, and Constantine of Laodicea date from the time after Justinian condemned the non-Chalcedonians by law in August 536.[97] As outlaws, whose writings it was forbidden to possess or

cause. Although most of Severus' letters are lost (see Chapter 4), a letter to Theodora or in which Severus referred to their spiritual relationship should have survived if it had existed. But neither a letter nor any reference to a correspondence between the two has survived.

[93] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.20, Brooks, 139f. (Brooks, 95; Hamilton and Brooks, 270).

[94] For Misael see *PLRE* II, 763f.

[95] Severus, *Select Letters* I.63, Brooks, 219–21 (197–9).

[96] Garland, *Byzantine Empresses*, 25.

[97] *Novella* 42; on Justinianic church law the best introduction remains H. S. Alivisatos, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I.*, Aalen: Scientia 1973 [Berlin: Trowitzsch & Son 1913]; for Severus see above; for Theodosius (who wrote his *Tome* to Theodora after 538) and Constantine (who wrote his address to the empress before 548) see *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*, van Roey and Allen, 16–56 and 66–71.

spread, the non-Chalcedonians could not just hand out their texts to anyone, because they endangered themselves and the recipients.[98] In his letter to Misael, Severus even wondered if the empress would fear the possession of his work. Theodora, however, risen from prostitute to the imperial throne, was shrewd enough to defend her status as non-Chalcedonian patroness against possible Chalcedonian accusations as well as she was able to handle non-Chalcedonian bishops. Although the council of 536 condemned Anthimus as a heretic, Theodora did not hesitate to hide him in her own palace, knowing that the Chalcedonians would not care to search for this poor ascetic for long. Severus, however, was a different matter, and even as empress she did not dare to hide him in Constantinople after 536.[99]

Foss remarks that 'it seems supremely ironic that an empress with no formal education should be receiving such intricately argued works'.[100] But from 535/6 onwards she represented the powerful non-Chalcedonian ear and mouth at the court in Constantinople. It was, therefore, important for non-Chalcedonian leaders to update her with their material so that she might be aware of their Christological discourse in case the emperor would again convene a debate on Christological issues.

There is no reason to assume that she received these writings because she had an acquired taste for theology—or Christology for that matter. Indeed, from Severus' notes about her, the former patriarch of Antioch neither seemed to have fond memories of her nor did he trust her theological or Christological abilities. The 'ardent' and 'zealous' non-Chalcedonian empress of many scholars appears rather as a very secular person who made fun of the Patristic past.[101] Since Severus' statement is the only contemporary note on

[98] *Novella* 42 explicitly condemned only Severus' writings to the flames ('concrementur a possessoribus'), but it also forbade Peter of Apamea to spread his doctrine, and the non-Chalcedonians in general to enter any discussion on faith etc.

[99] However, she helped him to escape, which was certainly the best solution for all sides; John of Beth Aphtonia, *Vie de Sévère*, Kugener, 257.

[100] Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 147. Foss nevertheless believes that she 'became so immersed in the theological controversies of the day that she could understand the debates and express an opinion on them'.

[101] Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 148, remarks that with the exception of Evagrius 'no one else raises a doubt about her sincere devotion to her faith'. However, this does not speak against Evagrius, a more reliable source than John of Ephesus on the one hand and Liberatus on the other.

Theodora, and not obscured by later demonization on the part of Procopius or sanctification on part of the non-Chalcedonians, it should be taken seriously.

From outside the empire, the empress received requests for non-Chalcedonian missions in Nubia and Arabia at the beginning of the 540s.[102] None of these missions were Theodora's initiative. She neither organized the evangelization of non-Christian peoples nor did she actively promote a non-Chalcedonian evangelization. By then, however, Theodora was well known as the non-Chalcedonian empress through her protection of non-Chalcedonians in the palace of Hormisdas. When both Nubians and Ghassanids asked for non-Chalcedonian missionaries, she functioned as an intermediary.[103] These peoples beseeched her as the most influential non-Chalcedonian at the court of Constantinople, and she assisted them by having non-Chalcedonian bishops sent to their countries.[104] Little did the imperial couple know that one of these bishops, Jacob Baradaeus, would not

[102] See especially I. Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Strukturanalyse Byzantinischer Mission zur Zeit Justins und Justinians*, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie 1974, 44–79 and 90–103. For Nubia see Richter, *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens, passim*, and H. Suermann, 'Der Bericht des Johannes von Ephesos über die Missionierung der Nubier im sechsten Jahrhundert', in *Symposium Syriacum VII. Uppsala University, 11–14 August 1996*, ed. R. Lavenant, OCA 256, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1998, 303–13. For other non-Chalcedonian missions that received support from Justin and Justinian see also G. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993, 100–38.

[103] Fowden, *From Empire to Commonwealth*, 113, assumes that these peoples wanted independence from Constantinople and therefore preferred non-Chalcedonian to Chalcedonian missionaries.

[104] John of Ephesus' story that Justinian supposedly sent his own Chalcedonian mission to Nubia (in competition with Theodora's non-Chalcedonian mission) is regarded by E. Hardy, 'The Egyptian Policy of Justinian', *DOP* 22 (1968), 36, as 'a formal gesture, not really intended to achieve its supposed purpose'. Richter's commentary on John of Ephesus in his *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens*, 61–5 and 111 is disappointing, as he only paraphrases John of Ephesus' account without analysing it; see also Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz*, 74–7.

It was not uncommon that an Arab tribe would ask the emperor to send Christian bishops who were regarded as heretics in the Roman empire. When the non-Nicenes ruled the Roman empire in the fourth century, an Arab tribe required that their bishop would be ordained by Nicene bishops in exile—and the Roman emperor complied; Sozomenus, *HE* VI.38 (trans. in Socrates and Sozomenus, *Church Histories*, trans. A. C. Zenos and C. D. Hartranft, NPNF 2, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1952, 374f.).

confine his ordinations to the Ghassanids, but filled the ranks of the non-Chalcedonian clergy everywhere in the East.[105] However, episcopal ordinations within the empire were not part of the officially blessed missionary work, and they only started years after the Second Council of Constantinople in 553.[106]

Theodora and John of Hephaestu

John of Ephesus amply refers to the empress' care for the non-Chalcedonian monks in the palace of Hormisdas. She hosted 500 monks in the palace, which subsequently appeared more like a monastery, with cells for the monks and altars for the celebration of the Eucharist. Here non-Chalcedonian monks could pray for the empress in peace day and night, and perhaps also for her husband and the empire. Not only the empress, but also Justinian sometimes visited the monks,[107] and the evidence suggests no opposition between Theodora and Justinian, but between Theodora and non-Chalcedonians: the empress served her husband, not the promotion of the non-Chalcedonian cause as John of Ephesus' *Life of John of Hephaestu* demonstrates.[108]

John of Hephaestu, originally from Palestine but ordained bishop of Hephaestu in Egypt around 535, came to Constantinople with the patriarch of Alexandria, Theodosius, in 536/7.[109] As Theodosius and his entourage did not accept Chalcedon even under threats, the emperor banned these Egyptian 'bishops with the most eminent clergy, about three hundred of them, in the interior of Thrace a day's journey off, [to] a certain fortress called Dercus'.[110] According to John of Ephesus it was a 'cruel place of exile' and the non-Chalcedonians

[105] D. D. Bundy, 'Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources and a New Approach', *Muséon* 91 (1978), 45–86. The Syrian Orthodox are sometimes called Jacobites after Jacob Baradaeus, and they commemorate him as one of their saints.

[106] See also general Conclusion.

[107] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 19, 680.

[108] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 526–40.

[109] For the date concerning Theodosius' arrival in Constantinople, see E. W. Brooks, 'The dates of the Alexandrine patriarchs Dioskoros II, Timothy IV and Theodosius', *BZ* 12 (1903), 493–7.

[110] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 528.

'were suffering distress' and 'were kept in custody there, though the Christ-loving Theodora [...] showed great attention to them as well as the other persecuted men everywhere, supplying them with provisions and liberal allowances'.[111] Unlike the monks, recluses, and solitaries in the palace of Hormisdas, the non-Chalcedonian clergy were no longer allowed free access to the capital. They were denied contact with Anthimus—of whom allegedly only Theodora and two servants knew that he lived in her palace—and the ascetics from all over the East who lived in the palace of Hormisdas.

It was not only a measure to keep groups of non-Chalcedonians separated: all the Egyptians appeared to have been ordained non-Chalcedonians whereas in the palace of Hormisdas probably only the archimandrites had been ordained priests.[112] The bishops in Thrace posed a danger for the Chalcedonians as they could ordain priests and enlarge the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical hierarchy. The effort to catch John of Tella in 537, at the same time as the bishops were banned to Thrace, demonstrates that the emperor desperately wished to prevent this.

In the same way, Theodora tried to hinder John of Hephaestu—about whom John of Ephesus said that he took up John of Tella's work—from ordaining non-Chalcedonian clergy. Non-Chalcedonians came to Constantinople to receive ordinations there and they even went up to Thrace. However, they could not get through to the non-Chalcedonian bishops in order to persuade them to perform ordinations. John of Hephaestu realized the dilemma that while the non-Chalcedonian clergy remained physically unharmed in Thrace, they had also been sequestered by the Chalcedonians, rendering them incapable of performing services for the non-Chalcedonian laity. He feigned illness in order to leave for Constantinople, where again Theodora provided him with a villa, allowances, and a slave. John, however, used his freedom to ordain clergy and to anoint altars in his

[111] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 529.

[112] 'Egyptians' is not used here in an ethnical sense but rather refers to bishops ordained for cities in Egypt. Concerning the palace of Hormisdas: John of Ephesus speaks only of stylites, recluses, solitaries, and archimandrites; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 19, 678. It is not clear what Peter of Apamea did, but *Novella* 42 banned him from Constantinople and other principal cities and he no longer played a major role. Maybe he died soon after 536.

villa. These altars were supposed to be sent to the East, where non-Chalcedonian priests, whom John of Tella had ordained, could use them for the celebration of the Eucharist.[113] Thereby John of Hephaestu enraged fellow non-Chalcedonians, who pointed out the risk John brought upon the whole non-Chalcedonian community in Constantinople. One man endangered the safety of all who lived in peace and protection by the empress. Because they were condemned heretics, they considered it foolish to stir up the anger of the imperial couple.

These non-Chalcedonians called upon the patriarch Theodosius to stop John, which obviously presented Theodosius with a moral dilemma. He could see the need of the non-Chalcedonians for ordinations but did not want to enrage the emperor. Although John of Ephesus wants the reader to believe that Theodosius supported John's work, the patriarch's answer was worthy of Pontius Pilate: 'He [John] has gone away from my presence, and is in the city, and the queen also has received him; and she further knows that I have not ordered him to do such things.'[114]

Therefore, the non-Chalcedonians who feared for their own safety and disassociated themselves from John went to Theodora. According to John of Ephesus they conducted a plot against John of Hephaestu so that the empress should order him to leave the city. They pretended that the emperor had ordered John's exile or, if he would not leave, John's death. They did not give John a reason why the emperor would have ordered his exile but they probably pretended that this was because of his ordinations—although they had apparently been too afraid to tell Theodora or Justinian about these ordinations.

In his anger John went to the imperial couple and bluntly accused both of them of persecuting believers. He asked them: 'Who has injured and disturbed me or God's church except you and your husband?'[115] The imperial couple was taken by surprise, and assured him that they did not order him to leave. Slowly the affair came to light and the non-Chalcedonian conspirators were interrogated.

[113] See also general Conclusion.
[114] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 532.
[115] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 534.

In order to defend themselves, they apparently revealed to the imperial couple the issue of John's ordinations. Theodora was not amused and told John: 'See that you remain within the palace, lest trial in truth come upon you. Remain still and keep quiet like your companions and do not make priests in this city.'[116] This order did not differ from Justinian's in 532/3 to the non-Chalcedonian bishops—and especially John of Tella among them—not to ordain any more clergy. By now, however, John of Hephaestu certainly knew John of Tella's fate and could envision the same fate happening to him if he refused Theodora's order.[117]

John of Hephaestu simply lied to the empress, pretending to 'have no desire for this business' and requesting to leave the city in order to recover from an illness. He immediately left for the East and gave out the sacraments and ordained clergy in the patriarchate of Constantinople and Antioch. As soon as he realized that the Chalcedonians, and especially the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem, had heard of his work, he returned to Constantinople. Cunningly he sent Theodora a letter excusing himself for not coming to Constantinople all this time because of his health. The news of a non-Chalcedonian bishop who ordained clergy reached the court at the same time, but they could not prove that John had been this non-Chalcedonian bishop. After this affair had been forgotten, John undertook a second journey to the East, again secretly and again successfully.

The cases of John of Tella and John of Hephaestu resemble each other. Both men had strong persuasions, acted independently, and did not accept the Chalcedonian authorities. John of Hephaestu wrote canons like John of Tella in order to educate the clergy whom he ordained.[118] Justinian forbade John of Tella to ordain clergy, Theodora John of Hephaestu. There was no disagreement between the imperial couple, but in both cases the couple could not prevent the non-Chalcedonian bishops from establishing a non-Chalcedonian hierarchy.

[116] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 534.

[117] John of Tella paid with his life for his boldness in refusing the emperor's request in 532/3 not to perform sacerdotal ministry for Chalcedonians and ordain people. Ephrem of Amida took great pains to catch John in Persia and bring him to Antioch, where he died in prison. See below.

[118] See Chapter 4.

Remembering Theodora

Theodora became a non-Chalcedonian empress not because she always had been a fervent non-Chalcedonian or had been converted by one of the non-Chalcedonian patriarchs. Theodora became a non-Chalcedonian empress in 535/6 by necessity because the exclusivity of the *libellus* caused the split after 518 and, through the establishment of a non-Chalcedonian hierarchy, the establishment of a separate church. This church could not be ignored if the emperor wished to rule his non-Chalcedonian subjects as well; the non-Chalcedonians were too numerous to be ignored. Since Justinian ruled as Chalcedonian emperor, who defended the decisions of 536, Theodora took charge of the non-Chalcedonians.[119] Her role for the non-Chalcedonians, however, not only becomes visible in non-Chalcedonian sources, but Chalcedonian authors also shaped the commemoration of her accordingly: Cyril of Scythopolis' saint Sabas presumably already knew at the beginning of the 530s that he did not wish the empress an (non-Chalcedonian) heir and successor to the throne and in Victor of Tunnuna's memory Pope Agapetus deprived Theodora of holy communion.[120]

It may be that Theodora's role was planned only as a temporary solution, but she remained a non-Chalcedonian empress until her death and beyond. If Chalcedonians in Constantinople, Antioch, or Rome suspected the emperor's orthodoxy, she could be blamed as the person who persuaded him to grant any favours to non-Chalcedonians. Most people probably believed that she had such a great influence on the emperor because for her Justin had changed the law in order to make the former prostitute suitable to the throne of Byzantium. Why

[119] Similarly Foss, 'The Empress Theodora', 171, but still maintaining Theodora's non-Chalcedonian faith: 'His solution was ingenious: allow his consort to patronize her church with minimal interference, so that its members, if not entirely placated, would at least not rise in revolt. This policy of doing the opposite of what he officially proclaimed suited an emperor in such a delicate situation, and suits the interpretation Procopius and Evagrius put on his acts.'

[120] *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1939, 173 (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. R. M. Price, CS 114, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1991, 183); see also below. Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronicle* 540, Plancanica, 42f; already questioned by Ensslin, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', 462.

should such a woman not be able to dictate religious policy for her husband? In reality, Theodora's freedom to influence politics was limited, and mostly confined to the non-Chalcedonian subjects who approached her. She was no more or less successful than her husband concerning religious policy because they were in it together.

In the non-Chalcedonian tradition she became a saint, devoted to Timothy in the Coptic version, devoted to Severus in the tradition of the Syrians.[121] Around the same time as the pre-persecution generation of non-Chalcedonian bishops died out, Theodora tried to integrate the evolving non-Chalcedonian church into Byzantium. John, however, did not see the empress in the context of imperial policy which tried to rule a divided Christian empire, but in a non-Chalcedonian framework of protectors and persecutors.[122] John even revised historical facts to make her work for the non-Chalcedonians appear earlier and greater than it actually was. He ascribed to her every imperial favour for the non-Chalcedonians, although her husband Justinian might have been responsible for them.

Some non-Chalcedonians like John of Hephaestu betrayed her and used her protection for their own ends. John of Ephesus had no interest in pointing this out, but instead praised her more in order to conceal the disagreement. Others, like John of Hephaestu's opponents, remained quiet under her protection, but these non-Chalcedonians were not those who built the Syrian Orthodox Church. Even by splitting their favours to Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians and attempting to suppress non-Chalcedonian ordinations, the imperial couple could not stop the establishment of this church. However, John of Ephesus could praise Theodora and later employ her memory because she represented the proof for non-Chalcedonians that non-Chalcedonianism was as much accepted at court in Constantinople as the Chalcedonian doctrine.

[121] 'Coptic' is used here in an ecclesiastical sense, not in terms of the language. The *Chronicle* of John of Nikiu in which Timothy is depicted as Theodora's spiritual father was probably written in Greek, but survives in an Ethiopic version only.

[122] Justinian's image in John of Ephesus remains ambiguous: J. J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus on Emperors: The Perception of the Byzantine Empire by a Monophysite', in *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992*, OCA 247, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1994, 326f., but see also the general Conclusion.

POST-538: ELIAS AND THE *LIFE OF JOHN OF TELLA*

Shortly after John bar Aphtonia, Severus of Antioch, and John of Tella died in 537/8, some dedicated followers initiated their commemoration as saints.[123] These three non-Chalcedonians represented three different ways of resisting the Chalcedonians: The learned archimandrite resisted together with his monks the implementation of the *libellus* and founded a new monastery, the patriarch escaped his persecutors and supplied the non-Chalcedonians with theological arguments for the controversy with the Chalcedonians, and finally John of Tella's unceasing efforts ensured the establishment of an ecclesiastical hierarchy for the Syrian Orthodox Church. At a time when the generation of non-Chalcedonian bishops who resisted the *libellus* died out and non-Chalcedonianism was condemned, it became important to commemorate their efforts for future generations. The authors of the lives provided the non-Chalcedonians with appropriate figures of identity who demonstrated why it was necessary to resist the implementation of Chalcedon even if the emperor enforced it. One of them, the *Life of John of Tella* by Elias, will be analysed here and compared to a famous pre-518 non-Chalcedonian saint's life in order to trace significant changes in the self-understanding of the non-Chalcedonians.

The character of John Rufus' *Life of Peter the Iberian*, written at the end of the fifth century, differs quite strikingly from Elias' *Life of John of Tella*, probably written shortly after 542.[124] Although the *Life of Peter the Iberian* contains all the typical features of hagiography, it also retains the individuality of its hero, providing a very colourful

[123] Anonymous, 'Histoire de Jean bar Aphtonia', ed. and trans. F. Nau, *ROC* 7 (1902), 97–135; Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, in *Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum*, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 7–8, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1907; John of Beth Aphtonia, *Vie de Sévère*, Kugener, 203–64. Severus' *Life* might have been written shortly after Severus' death, John of Tella's *Life* probably shortly after the conquest of Callinicum in 542, but John bar Aphtonia's *Life* remains difficult to date.

[124] [John Rufus], *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des Fünften Jahrhunderts*, ed. and trans. R. Raabe, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1895; for John Rufus' authorship see E. Schwartz, *Johannes Rufus, ein monophysitischer Schriftsteller*, SHAW.PH 16, Heidelberg: Carl Winter 1912.

narrative. Peter's *Life* hardly contains a discussion about the right faith, but eucharistic miracles prove to the non-Chalcedonian reader or hearer that his persuasion was orthodox.[125] In the *Life of John of Tella* miracles are absent, and although John's more than extraordinary life could provide enough material to make it a highly embellished narrative about John's career as monk, bishop in Tella, bishop in exile, and a man whom the Chalcedonians hunted down mercilessly, it remains remarkably colourless in comparison to the *Life of Peter the Iberian.*

The *Life of Peter the Iberian* narrates the life of a non-Chalcedonian saint but in contrast to John's *Life*, Peter's *Life* did not gain its legitimacy from the struggle against the Chalcedonians. One of the highlights in Peter's *Life* is his flight from Constantinople and arrival in Jerusalem in the 430s, where he met his first spiritual teacher and became a serious ascetic. The Council of Chalcedon took place more than a decade later when Peter had already established himself as a well-known ascetic and holy man. Later, opposition to Chalcedon became part of Peter's life, but Peter was remembered as a saint first of all because of his asceticism and personal holiness, which led even Jews to convert and Samaritans to come to his funeral. Non-Chalcedonians like Severus regarded him as their spiritual father, but more because he set a personal (of course non-Chalcedonian) example than because Peter recruited monks and organized resistance in a battle against Chalcedon.[126]

If severe asceticism, personal integrity, and the ability to perform miracles had remained the criteria for a non-Chalcedonian saint's life, John of Tella would not have been remembered in this way.[127]

[125] For the eucharistic miracles see V. Déroche, 'Représentations de l'eucharistie dans la haute époque Byzantine', in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron* (Travaux et Mémoires 14), Paris 2002, 167–80, and V. Menze, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma. Johannes Rufus, das Konzil von Chalkedon und die wahre Kirche', in J. Hahn and Ch. Ronning, *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2003, 215–32.

[126] See C. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006, especially 101–11.

[127] The Chalcedonians even accused John of Tella of having deceived people with his hair tunic, the black robes, and the long beard because that was how people imagined a saint would look; Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 77f. (Ghanem, 89).

Certainly, the author Elias credited John with being ascetic, a statement that Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor confirmed.[128] But Osrhoene was probably well-populated with ascetic monks like John of Tella without all being perceived as distinguished saints. John of Tella's *Life* is the life of a man who 'increased his efforts to gather the Church together and to deliver her from the Diophysite heresy'.[129] It was a life of struggle for the orthodox (non-Chalcedonian) faith and against the Chalcedonians that led in the end to John's martyrdom.

Almost half of John's *Life* is dedicated to his last year of life, the time he spent in Chalcedonian captivity.[130] Considering the long introduction, less than half of the *Life* narrates his actual life as monk and bishop. Nevertheless, Elias regarded John's episcopal deeds of ordaining a non-Chalcedonian hierarchy as fundamental for defending the orthodox church. In the second half of the *Life*—comprising John's last year—Elias worked into the story of John's capture in Persia and his captivity a discourse on the orthodox church and its faith.

Elias proves to be a sophisticated author who, through statements put into John's mouth, refutes implied and outspoken accusations brought forth by the Chalcedonians against the non-Chalcedonians. According to Elias, the patriarch Ephrem of Amida, who needed the assistance of the Persians to catch John in Persia, deceived the Persians. As reasons why Ephrem wished to get hold of John, he allegedly told the Persians that John had made money with his ordinations and had rebelled against the emperor. After the Persians caught John, they brought up these accusations against the saint. But John convinced them that he did not possess any gold, that he was 'not rebelling against our victorious, peaceful, and merciful Emperor', and that he prayed 'on his behalf that he [the emperor] may govern his kingdom according to God's will'.[131] John thereby demonstrated that the non-Chalcedonians had only the best intentions and loved the emperor as much as any of his subjects should do.

[128] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* VIII.5, Brooks, 82 (Brooks, 56; Hamilton and Brooks, 211f.).

[129] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 60 (Ghanem, 70).

[130] 30 pages out of 64 pages in Brooks' edition (pp. 65–95).

[131] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 73 (Ghanem, 84).

That John had actually been accused of simony remains unlikely, but the question of the loyalty of non-Chalcedonians to a Chalcedonian emperor was probably in the air.[132] Elias refuted this suspicion, and let the Persians—who believed John—be the witnesses for the truthfulness of the non-Chalcedonians and the wickedness of the Chalcedonians.

From defending John and non-Chalcedonians in general against accusations by their opponents, Elias switched gears and launched a full-scale attack on the Chalcedonians: 'Let your Lordship [the Persian king] know that those who hate me [John] are persecuting me only because I do not forsake the creed in which I was baptized and in which even they, too, were baptized, to embrace that other one which even they, like me, formerly anathematized.'[133] Although it is not entirely clear what Elias meant when he noted that the Chalcedonians had anathematized Chalcedon, he probably referred to the period under Anastasius when the imperial policy was more favourable to the non-Chalcedonians. It is unquestionable that Elias presented the Chalcedonians as delegitimizing their cause by switching their faith and persecuting non-Chalcedonians.

John accused his persecutors, saying that their way of 'learning is not civilized. This is how you convert the world; this is how the Arab Munzir was forcefully converted.'[134] John also clarified for the reader that not he—whom the Chalcedonians accused of unruliness—but the Chalcedonians were the cause of the disrupted state of the church: 'Who is disturbing the Church of God, I [John], or those who are leading large troops of Goths, violently and with all sorts of torture compelling the people of God to surrender? Whoever suppresses the truth by force of public law carries out the purposes of the world as was the case during pagan times.'[135] These are the same accusations that the Nicenes used against the non-Nicenes in power in the fourth century.[136] More than the pagan Persians, the Chalcedonians who

[132] For the accusation of receiving money for his ordinations see also Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 78 (Ghanem, 89).

[133] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 73 (Ghanem, 84).

[134] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 84f. (Ghanem, 97).

[135] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 77 (Ghanem, 88).

[136] See Chapter 1. John referred to Athanasius as an example of a true bishop while the non-Nicenes occupied the churches; Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 75 (Ghanem, 86).

employed the Goths against the orthodox church were truly barbarians. Whereas in the *Life of Peter the Iberian* the term 'church' almost exclusively refers to a local church building, in the *Life of John of Tella* the term usually means figuratively the universal Church. This universal Church was represented by John of Tella, not by the patriarch in power, the Chalcedonian Ephrem of Amida who made his descent to the East with a 'sizeable army'.

In the second half of John's *Life*, Elias staged Christological and ecclesiastical debates between Ephrem and John. These debates are very sophisticated and certainly fictitious because Ephrem's introductory speech comprised two statements which no Chalcedonian would have made in 537. Ephrem supposedly told John that everyone should speak freely about belief, and should change his belief if he is proved wrong. Only the Jews preferred to retain their false beliefs and did not want to change this.[137] However, according to the *Novella* 42 of 536, Justinian had forbidden discussions on faith, and Ephrem would have hardly encouraged non-Chalcedonians to overrule imperial law. Furthermore, Ephrem probably did not bring up the example of the Jews because it was a non-Chalcedonian accusation against the Chalcedonians that the Chalcedonians were like the Jews and did not believe in the crucified God.[138] The statement that every wise man would change his faith if he was proved wrong, of course, turned out against Ephrem himself, who could not win against John in the following debate.[139]

In the debate on the nature of Christ, one of Ephrem's associates posed questions, and John had the chance to reply with lengthy quotations from Cyril. John was even able to give the name of Cyril's treatise or letter he quoted: The *Letter to Acacius* (of Melitene) had also come up in the debate of 532/3, which shows that the non-Chalcedonians probably had a firm set of Cyril's texts in favour of the one-nature Christology.[140] In the end, the Chalcedonians had to cut John off in order not to let him finish his interpretation of Cyril and

[137] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 80 (Ghanem, 92).

[138] See the later non-Chalcedonian fabrication of a letter allegedly written by Jews to the emperor Marcian (450–7): L. van Rompay, 'A Letter of the Jews to the Emperor Marcian concerning the Council of Chalcedon', *OLoP* 12 (1981), 215–24.

[139] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 81–3 (Ghanem, 93–5).

[140] See Chapter 2.

win the debate. Instead, they told the people who waited outside that John agreed to the dyophysite Christology. The trick fits Elias' narrative well: only an evil deception allowed Ephrem to win against Elias' saint, but the *Life*'s reader or hearer would know better than the crowd which fell for it!

Whereas eucharistic miracles performed by a holy man like Peter the Iberian were necessary in Peter's *Life* in order to prove to the reader that God was on the side of the non-Chalcedonians, here it is Cyril. As in the debate in Constantinople, a decade before Elias wrote down this story, Cyril and his texts were now paramount for any discussion on the nature of Christ.

In a follow-up to the debate on the nature of Christ, the Chalcedonians accused the non-Chalcedonians of being 'acephalous', that is, headless. John replied that their head was Christ and then the patriarchs Severus, Theodosius, and Anthimus, and all the orthodox bishops who were persecuted.[141] For John or for a non-Chalcedonian author like Elias, having written John's *Life* more than twenty years after the initial expulsion of bishops, the experience of persecution clearly defined who was a non-Chalcedonian.

These non-Chalcedonians, who had distinguished themselves in the persecutions, formed the orthodox church. Not just John of Tella and the other bishops, but, as Elias said in his introduction, all of 'us, you and those like you [the addressees, probably two monks], who have behaved so wonderfully despite the troubles of living in the midst of the difficult and perverse generation'.[142] The persecutions caused a sense of otherness on the part of the non-Chalcedonians, and John's efforts created for them a different institution—a separate church. Elias did not describe two churches, a Chalcedonian and a non-Chalcedonian, but in his understanding there was only one Church, and John personified the struggle of every non-Chalcedonian for this church against the reigning Chalcedonians.

Elias' *Life of John of Tella* retains less individuality than John Rufus' *Life of Peter the Iberian* because what John said, any non-Chalcedonian could and should have said in defence of the non-Chalcedonian cause. Elias did not focus on John's ordinations, as the separation of

[141] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 85 (Ghanem, 97).
[142] Elias, *Life of John of Tella*, Brooks, 32 (Ghanem, 42).

the two Christian groups and the establishment of a non-Chalcedonian church by John had become a fact which Elias took for granted. For him, more important was the question which side had the better arguments and could win the day. He skilfully introduced into debates arguments and rebukes from both sides while ensuring at the same time the moral superiority of the non-Chalcedonians. Elias' work demonstrates that the non-Chalcedonians had become aware of the fact that they formed a separate church with a different understanding of the Church Fathers and a different historical experience.

JOHN OF EPHESUS AND ABRAHAM BAR KAYLI

More influential than Elias' *Life of John of Tella* and the two other post-538 hagiographies were John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, written almost thirty years later. At that point, Jacob Baradaeus, the non-Chalcedonian bishop and missionary to the Ghassanids, had not only continued John of Tella's and John of Hephaestu's work, but he had also established a new non-Chalcedonian episcopal hierarchy by having ordained almost thirty bishops.[143] Jacob Baradaeus ordained John as bishop of Ephesus *c.*558, but John probably stayed for a good part of his later life in Constantinople, where he became one of the leading non-Chalcedonian bishops involved in church affairs and wrote down his view of the past. John's fame is partly due to his large œuvre comprising fifty-eight saints' lives in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* and a *Church History*—or better: church histories, as the three parts of his *Church History* evolved as different works.[144]

[143] Bundy, 'Jacob Baradaeus', 45–86. See general Conclusion.

[144] One *Life* is missing in the collection of the *Lives of the Eastern Saints*; one of the *Lives* of Jacob Baradaeus is ascribed to John. For his *Church History* see van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 46–85. The first two parts survive partially in the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, also called the Chronicle of Ps.-Dionysius; for Ps.-Dionysius see W. Witakowski, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē: A Study in the History of Historiography*, Studia Semitica Upsaliensis 9, Uppsala 1987; the third part of John's *Church History*, a later work and independent from the first two parts, survives, but the period it mainly covers (571–88) is not of interest here.

John of Ephesus wrote his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* in the early years of Justin II's reign (565–78). It was an ambiguous religious situation since the non-Chalcedonians were condemned, but Justin II wished to come to an agreement with them and let them live in peace until 572.[145] The non-Chalcedonians had already been disappointed many times before by the former emperor Justinian, and their expectations for any religious change under a new emperor were certainly low.[146]

How did John of Ephesus remember his fellow ascetics and bishops, and their sufferings or memorable deeds in this situation? A partial answer has already been given in the analysis of the non-Chalcedonian monks, and of Anthimus and Theodora. John's account of the expulsion of monks exaggerated the extent of the expulsions, and his loving memory of Anthimus and Theodora mystified the past. By erasing the complexity of the past, John left out the average non-Chalcedonian and his experience during the reigns of Justin and Justinian. The sufferings of the monks became universal, the solitary Anthimus became integrated into John's community of holy non-Chalcedonian patriarchs, and Theodora's favours for the non-Chalcedonians exceeded in John's commemoration her actual intentions.

A second part of the answer must analyse how John presented the opposing party, the Chalcedonians. The case of Abraham bar Kayli will be employed here in order to show how John (mis)represented the deeds of the Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida and established an image of him as the 'archvillain' in the Syrian Orthodox tradition.[147] John reshaped the past so that the actual historical person is hardly recognizable, and he manipulated historical information to fit into a suggestive framework which demonized Chalcedonians and sanctified steadfast non-Chalcedonians.

[145] Av. Cameron, 'The Early Religious Policies of Justin II', in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, Studies in Church History 13, ed. D. Barker, Oxford: Blackwell 1976, 51–67. It was also the period when a serious controversy—the Tritheist controversy—arose among the non-Chalcedonians.

[146] Van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus on Emperors', 333. John wrote the *Lives of the Eastern Saints* in 566/8 in Constantinople for his former fellow monks at the monastery of John Urtaya in Amida; van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 93f.

[147] For Abraham bar Kayli and the following case study see also Chapter 3.

Abraham does not appear at all in the Chalcedonian tradition; only Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, John of Ephesus, and Michael the Syrian mention him in their works. Before he became metropolitan of Amida he had been a steward in the church of Dara under a non-Chalcedonian bishop. After Justin's accession he turned Chalcedonian and became metropolitan of Amida in 521. The monks rioted against him and drove him out of the city. Fifty people were put to death after the Chalcedonians took over the city again. John of Ephesus blamed Abraham for this and called him a 'wretched person' possessed by Satan who 'barbarously, savagely and mercilessly engaged in killings, crucifixions and the burning of believers'.[148] However, as already discussed in Chapter 3, Roman law justified the death penalty in these cases and their death sentences were probably ordered by Justin's hangman Bar Yohannan anyway. John's judgement was less the result of an objective perception of the events at stake than due to his anger about a successful Chalcedonian metropolitan.

Abraham's success becomes visible through some further facts. Although it remains impossible to define the ratio of Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians among the population in the province of Mesopotamia I in the first half of the sixth century, the scale of expulsions in this province strongly suggests that a majority of Christians were non-Chalcedonians. It comes as a surprise, therefore, that Abraham bar Kayli ruled in Amida for thirty years during these unstable times.[149] If this does not speak for his popularity *per se* then it at least attests to his administrative abilities to rule as a bishop in a metropolitan city close to the Persian border.

But although Abraham ruled Amida in relative peace, some of the non-Chalcedonian monks could not be reconciled to him. One of them, Sergius, an austere ascetic living in the territory of Amida, opposed Abraham openly.[150] Sergius attracted students, taught them the Scriptures and over the years built a retinue of disciples. In fact,

[148] *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 32f. (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies: Toronto 1999, 61).

[149] Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* IX.26, Chabot, 297 (223).

[150] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 84–111.

John of Ephesus believed Sergius' prayer to be so powerful that John came all the way from Constantinople in order to receive a blessing from him before Sergius died.

Even before Abraham bar Kayli became the Chalcedonian metropolitan of Amida, in other words when the non-Chalcedonians still ruled in Amida and Mesopotamia, Sergius distinguished himself as a zealous ascetic.[151] Sergius not only condemned the Jews, who 'should not be allowed to live at all', but also collected twenty of his disciples and burned down the local synagogue at night.[152] With the stones of the synagogue they built a little martyr shrine. His enthusiasm did not please the non-Chalcedonian church in Amida. The Jews complained to the church on account of the fact that the synagogue had stood on church land and paid fees to the church for its use. This brought the church into moral dilemma as they had no interest in Sergius' destructive zeal nor could it accept his unlawful actions. But how could the church criticize a zealous Christian who acted against the 'crucifiers of the Son of God' without being accused as a persecutor of Christians?[153] It seems that the church officially tried to stay out of it, but unofficially encouraged the Jews to destroy the huts of Sergius and his disciples and rebuild their synagogue.[154] If the non-Chalcedonians had hoped that the conflict would thereby be resolved and that Sergius would be discouraged from further action or maybe even feel compelled to leave the area, Sergius proved them wrong. He and his disciples destroyed the synagogue once again and the Jews desisted from rebuilding it within Sergius' lifetime.[155]

[151] This may have taken place under Abraham bar Kayli's immediate predecessor Mara. This and the episode concerning Abraham bar Kayli take up much of Sergius' *Life*.

[152] John does not name the village in which the synagogue stood, but it belonged to the territory of Amida. John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 91.

[153] As a comparison, see the destruction of a synagogue under Valentinian in Callinicum: Ambrose, *ep.* 1a, 7: 'Necesse erit igitur, ut aut praevaricatorem aut martyrem faciat;' (*Sancti Ambrosi Opera*, vol. x, ed. M. Zelzer, CSEL 82, Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky 1982, 165). See for this N. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1994, 298ff., and M. Gaddis, *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2005, 190ff.

[154] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 92.

[155] Sergius seems to have tried to destroy the synagogue first on his own by 'pulling it to pieces stone by stone'. The effect was apparently not overwhelming, as he needed to send his disciples, who burnt down the new synagogue; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 93.

This over-zealous non-Chalcedonian ascetic felt disturbed by the arrival of the Chalcedonian metropolitan in Amida, Abraham bar Kayli, and went to the church in Amida to interrupt the mass.[156] In front of Abraham bar Kayli and the whole congregation of Amida—including both Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians who used to be present there 'during the hearing of the service and the lessons and the preacher'—Sergius went to the chancel, where the preacher had probably stopped speaking at the sight of the anchorite bearing a cross over his shoulder. John of Ephesus claims that Sergius was prepared for martyrdom, but it seems that Sergius only undertook a calculated risk. He cursed Chalcedon and all (Chalcedonian) heretics and hit the poor preacher. If he had physically attacked Abraham bar Kayli himself, a martyr's death would have awaited him. This way, however, he only caused uproar among an audience which was divided as to whether he should be punished or not. Abraham bar Kayli calmed down the crowd and decided to talk to Sergius in the vestry without the crowd.

John of Ephesus suspected this manœuvre to be a mere trick in order to prevent non-Chalcedonians in the crowd from assisting their hero. Indeed, according to John, Sergius was beaten in the vestry and later sent to a steadfast Chalcedonian monastery in Armenia.[157] Any objective assessment, however, must give credit to Abraham bar Kayli's thoughtful conduct. He was able to handle Sergius' provocation without being provoked and reaching rash and ill-advised decisions in front of an enraged crowd. The fact that Abraham did not need soldiers to protect him in church indicates that the new metropolitan felt secure in Amida, and had quickly gained control over the city once the usurpation of the monks had been crushed.[158]

[156] This happened shortly after Abraham's arrival; see Brooks' footnote in John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 98.

[157] From which he was able to escape within three days; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 5, in *PO* 17, 104f.

[158] It is obvious that John of Ephesus would have mentioned soldiers if there were any in the church. For the question of violence or peaceful coexistence between rival Christian groups see N. McLynn, 'Christian Controversy and Violence in the Fourth Century', *Kodai* 3 (1992), 15–44, who rightly emphasized the importance of coexistence against R. MacMullen, 'The Historical Role of the Masses in Late Antiquity', in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990, 250–76.

Although John of Ephesus presents Sergius as a hero for the non-Chalcedonian cause, these episodes cannot conceal the fact that Sergius' actions were provocations and served his own agenda far more than the interest of the non-Chalcedonians. For the non-Chalcedonian church in Amida before Abraham bar Kayli's tenure, Sergius' conduct towards the Jewish community was an embarrassment. Later, his appearance in the church in Amida shows that he was not part of the average non-Chalcedonian population which sat quietly in church with their Chalcedonian neighbours. Certainly, a saint was supposed to take the lead and distinguish himself from the average person, but here it seems that Sergius was an annoyance for Chalcedonians as well as non-Chalcedonians.[159] On the other hand, Abraham bar Kayli had obviously been able to attract people of both denominations to come to his mass, and was able to deal with exceptional circumstances professionally.

Although John tried to present Abraham bar Kayli as a wicked persecutor, John's accusations show the metropolitan as a rational and effective administrator rather than a zealous persecutor. Abraham bar Kayli

> registered the neighborhoods, courtyards and houses of the city, men and women, everybody by name. He compelled them [to] be entered on the (church) registers and take the Eucharist. He forced women to register themselves so that they would bring for baptism not only the infants that had been born but also those who were yet to be born, whenever they would give birth to them![160]

With such a register—which seems to have been more inclusive than the usual register of the poor—Abraham bar Kayli could control the

[159] Sergius might not have been representative for the collection of *Eastern Saints* as a whole, but there are other examples of this kind. Simeon the Mountaineer dedicated one-third of the children of a village to the church, and thereby enraged the villagers, who lost a much-needed workforce; see V. Menze, 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', *Hugoye* 7.2 (2004) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol7No2/HV7N2Menze.html], par. 11. The charity work of other ascetics was certainly welcomed by the population: see S. Ashbrook Harvey, 'The Politicisation of the Byzantine Saint', in *The Byzantine Saint: University of Birmingham Fourteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, ed. S. Hackel, Studies Supplementary to Sobornost 5, London: Fellowhip of St Alban and St Sergius 1981, 40; and *eadem*, 'Johannes von Ephesus', 560.

[160] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 34 (Harrak, 61).

members of his community. In other words, Abraham installed an efficient system with which he tried to enforce official Chalcedonian doctrine among the whole congregation and, planning in longer terms, their children. Abraham bar Kayli did not remain alone in his worries about the denomination of future generations. Cyril of Scythopolis recalled in his *Life of Sabas* that the saint, asked by the empress Theodora to pray that God might give her a child, did not grant the imperial wish. Later asked by his followers why he refused her wish, he assured them that the empress would not bear a child 'lest it suck in the doctrines of Severus and cause worse upheaval to the Church than Anastasius'.[161] Cyril presents it as God's plan that the empress could not have a child which might become a non-Chalcedonian ruler. The idea behind it, that the present generation would transmit their belief to their children, is the same as in the case of Abraham's attempt to control the baptism of the children of non-Chalcedonian families.

John, however, also narrates more gruesome stories about Abraham's rule in Amida. He accused the metropolitan of burning believers alive, a charge which he corroborated with one example. It might be the case that there were more examples, but this is unlikely. Since John was very keen to describe the physical sufferings of the non-Chalcedonians and recorded them at length, why would he miss a chance to narrate another martyr story?

John recalled only the case of a priest from the village of Ligin whose conduct, however, justified Abraham bar Kayli's decision. This priest not only refused to accept communion with his metropolitan, but when forced with a spoon to eat it, he spat it out.[162] Bar Kayli did not hesitate but burned the priest at the *tetrapylon* of the city.[163] The

[161] *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Schwartz, 173 (Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, Price, 183). Cyril probably ascribed this to Sabas later, after it had become clear that Theodora did not bear another child and acted as patroness of non-Chalcedonians in public.

[162] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 34–6 (Harrak, 62f.). Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* IX.16, Chabot, 272 (181f.).

[163] The pattern of forcing members of the community to take the Eucharist was already well known in the fourth century. Socrates, *HE* II.38, and Sozomen, *HE* V.2, narrate that non-Nicene bishops forced people to communion. Of course the bishops who force others were always depicted as the wicked heretics—the 'Arians' in the fourth and the Chalcedonians in the sixth century.

profanation of something holy—here the sacrament—was in pagan and Christian times a severe crime which commonly called for the death penalty in the form of burning.[164] By reporting to the emperor that the priest had deliberately defiled the Eucharist, Abraham bar Kayli tried to prevent any accusations against himself that he might have provided the non-Chalcedonians with a martyr.[165]

John of Ephesus went even further and depicted Abraham's rule in Amida as a reign of sheer terror. He accused the Chalcedonian metropolitan of having sent a horde of lepers from a hospice of lepers outside the city, called 'Mar Romanus', to the house of a believer.[166] The lepers caused the owner to leave his house, and in a short time they made the house uninhabitable and all the food uneatable. They acted partly on their own, defiling the provisions when they were already ordered to leave the house, because, as John said, they were wicked people.

Having met Abraham bar Kayli as an able administrator, it would be surprising if he made such an irrational decision as to employ lepers merely to terrify his Christian opponents.[167] His own congregation would not have supported such an outrageous order besides

[164] R. MacMullen, 'Judicial Savagery in the Roman Empire', in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990, 209; see also Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot 1899, 595–605.

[165] Christians in power, of course, avoided providing 'heretical' groups with martyrs; Gaddis, in *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ*, 98–102, argues that the imperial government hesitated to execute especially bishops on religious grounds. John described it as if Abraham misinformed the emperor, thereby making Abraham solely responsible while taking away any blame from the emperor.

[166] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 37f. (Harrak, 63f.). Michael the Syrian, *Chronique* IX.16, Chabot, 272f. (182). That Abraham bar Kayli did this more than once, as John seems to imply, cannot be verified.

[167] As far as I can see there is no parallel to this story. The archimandrites and monks of Syria II complained about 'pestiferos homines' whom Severus had sent against them (*Coll. Avell.* ep. 139.5 (*Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio*, vol. ii, ed. Otto Guenther, CSEL 35.2, Prague and Vienna: F. Tempsky 1898, 567), but this cannot be understood as disease-carrying persons in a medical sense. 'Pest bringende Menschen' as H. Suermann, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998, 75, translates, remains ambiguous. For the use of 'pestiferus' see for example 'pestiferae tyrannidis', referring to the rule of Magnentius (350–3): *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, vol. i, ed. H. Dessau, Berlin: Weidmann 1954, no. 731; see also Chapter 2 n. 54.

the fact that the lepers' unruliness made them dangerous for Chalcedonians as well. It is therefore necessary to look for a more rational explanation why Abraham bar Kayli sent lepers to the house of a non-Chalcedonian.

Amida was not an immediate frontier city, but still close to the Persian border and vulnerable to Persian attacks. In 526/7 the Romans tried to build a fortress at Melabas in order to secure the border between Dara and Martyropolis against Persian attacks on Amida.[168] The Roman forces which should have protected the building of the fortress were defeated, and it is unclear if the Romans ever built it. A year later a Persian army invaded Mesopotamia and proved the defence insufficient, which distressed Justinian 'extremely'.[169] Justinian sent senators 'with their forces' from Constantinople to select cities in the East, among them Amida, to which the emperor sent the senator Plato. The chronicler John Malalas did not explain exactly what they did in these cities or for how long they stayed. But they obviously came to defend the eastern cities, and might have also taken steps to strengthen the fortifications of the cities. That perhaps included the 'flattening [of] all monasteries and inns which were situated adjacent to the [city] wall' as the Edessenes did in 502 when the Persian king Kawad approached their city with an army.[170] As John mentions that the leper hospice of Mar Romanus was outside the city of Amida, it could have fallen victim to such an undertaking. The city council in conjunction with the military advisor probably ordered the destruction of this hospice, but Abraham bar Kayli as bishop was responsible for its inmates and needed to relocate them. He was entitled to billet them in another house during the crisis and before a permanent living place had been found. He seems to have chosen the house of a non-Chalcedonian. From John's description of

[168] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* IX.5, Brooks, 95f. (Brooks, 66; Hamilton and Brooks, 226f.). Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 265.

[169] John Malalas, *Chronicle* XVIII.26; *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB 35, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000, 368f. (*The Chronicle of John Malalas*, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986, 256).

[170] *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, composed in Syriac A.D. 507*, ed. and trans. W. Wright, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1882, 59 (*The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*, trans. F. R. Trombley and J. W. Watt, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000, 75).

the house with its 'beautiful and clean furniture', beds, garments, and provisions of wine, oil, honey, etc., it might have been the suburban estate of a rich non-Chalcedonian outside Amida. This presents a more plausible explanation than John's postulation that Abraham bar Kayli wanted to spread terror.[171]

The Chalcedonian metropolitan was an able, caring, and shrewd administrator. In 537 Abraham bar Kayli did not order the expulsion of the Amidene monks from their temporary place of settlement, but instead he let soldiers be billeted to the villages where the monks lived. The soldiers told the villagers that they would stay as long as the monks, and thereby made the villagers expel the monks on their own because the villages ran out of food.[172] Once again, although John intended to kindle the reader's sympathy for the monks, his account provides the historian with an example of how Abraham controlled a difficult situation without violence.

In conclusion, Abraham bar Kayli was Chalcedonian and therefore became in John's commemoration *per definitionem* evil and wicked. In the non-Chalcedonian perception any of Abraham's measures formed part of his zeal to torture non-Chalcedonians—although they might have been justified by objective standards like Roman law. Against Abraham's efficient regime of control, John of Ephesus was only able to bring forth angry and defiant, but somewhat helpless, accusations.

John reduced the complexity of the events by establishing an insurmountable opposition between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. The average non-Chalcedonian who struggled either to obey the new metropolitan and his faith or to maintain the faith in which he was baptized hardly plays a role in John of Ephesus' hagiography. The image of the undecided would have disturbed and complicated John's picture of this period. John wrote history in ways that would allow the monks of the 560s and 570s—who were the immediate audience of his hagiography—and following generations of Syrian Orthodox to understand this period as a time of persecution which caused the non-Chalcedonians to separate from

[171] Other stories by John of Ephesus about shaven monks sent to believers are too short and unspecific to reveal what exactly was at stake.

[172] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 39f. (Harrak, 64f.).

the imperial church and establish their own church. He offered them an alternative understanding of the past in contrast to the official imperial reading and also against a papal perception of the past. His hagiography gave the monks examples of monk-saints and figures of identity on the one hand, and the image of a devilish opponent from whom they should distinguish themselves on the other hand.

CONCLUSION

The religious landscape had changed since 518: Justin enforced Hormisdas' *libellus* and was able to suppress the violent resistance of non-Chalcedonian monks in 521. However, he could not erase non-Chalcedonianism, and the expulsion of bishops and monks in 518–25 proved to be unsuccessful in the long run. The non-Chalcedonians recovered from the losses of their episcopal sees and established an ecclesiastical hierarchy at the end of the 520s. Although this new hierarchy remained tenuous—John of Tella mainly ordained deacons and priests—in 530 it became urgent for Justinian to reconsider his policy.

After Pope Agapetus stopped Justinian's policy of rapprochement, the empress Theodora took over the patronage of the non-Chalcedonian 'heretics'. In the commemoration of the non-Chalcedonians she became the 'believing queen' who shared their faith and tried to lighten the burden of the condemned. The non-Chalcedonians started to reflect on their post-518 past and formed a self-understanding which allowed them to regard themselves as the orthodox church.

This process of reflecting on their recent past found its expression in post-538 non-Chalcedonian writings, namely hagiography and church history. It was undertaken by a generation of non-Chalcedonians who grew up during the reigns of Justin and Justinian. Elias, the author of *The Life of John of Tella*, is one example, John of Ephesus, the most influential one, another. Elias perceived the separation of the non-Chalcedonians from the Chalcedonians as a fact, and his work intended to encourage his (monastic) non-Chalcedonian

audience to stay firm in their persuasion. Also John of Ephesus' writings expect a monastic non-Chalcedonian audience which found confirmation in its resistance against the imperial church through the moral and spiritual superiority of John's saints who had opposed the Chalcedonian persecutors in the past.

However, as John wrote for the exceptionally violent Amidene monks, neither his audience nor the author might have been representative for the general non-Chalcedonian audience or other non-Chalcedonian authors. Hardly anything is known about the non-Chalcedonian audience, but anxious non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople, like John of Hephaestu's opponents, certainly did not form the recipients of John's œuvre. They might have preferred Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's *Church History*, a much more balanced account than John's writings. Ps.-Zachariah often even comes up with a positive statement about Chalcedonian bishops in the past which could help his audience to accept the rule of the Chalcedonians more easily than John's narrations.[173]

In fact, persons like John of Tella or John of Hephaestu were certainly exceptional among the non-Chalcedonians as were their biographers. A less biased Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor stood more in the tradition of church historians like Socrates or Sozomenus than John of Ephesus. Therefore, while John of Ephesus certainly found his more radical monastic audience, it might have been that there was a majority of non-Chalcedonians in the 540s who favoured (like the opponents of John of Hephaestu) a peaceful coexistence between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, even if this would endanger the future of non-Chalcedonianism in general.

This cannot be more than an assumption, as persons like John of Hephaestu and later John of Ephesus set the tone for non-Chalcedonian politics in the 540s–570s. And although Justinian still worked for a unification of Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, even anxious non-Chalcedonians must have realized that there was no return to the pre-persecution times. The event which should have demonstrated even to the hesitant non-Chalcedonian that their separation had become permanent, was the Second Council of Constantinople.

[173] For example Ps.-Zachariah's judgement on Asclepius of Edessa or Ephrem of Amida; see Chapter 3.

Conclusion: Justinian, the Syrian Orthodox 536–553, and Subsequent Perceptions of the Sixth-Century Schism

INTRODUCTION

There can hardly be any doubt that Justinian tried, to use a phrase by Procopius, 'to gather all men into one belief as to Christ'.[1] The emperor worked for a unity of Christian dogma for decades because a universalist religion like Christianity called for a united Church of a (Christian) empire.[2] In 551 the emperor issued his *Edict on the True Faith* in which he defined 'orthodoxy'. Justinian intended his *Edict* to be a unifying text as he stated in the preamble that those 'who confess the true faith might guard it with firmness, and those who contend against it may learn the truth and hasten to unite themselves to the holy Church of God'.[3] However, Justinian's understanding of 'orthodoxy' did not find approval by Pope Vigilius (537–55), who had already stayed in Constantinople for years. A general council which European Christendom regards as the fifth ecumenical council was

[1] Procopius, *Anecdota* XIII.7, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 290, 158f. Also Av. Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London: Duckworth 1985, 80, stresses Justinian's sincerity in reconciling Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

[2] For the development of how to understand a Christian empire and a Christian emperor see G. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993, 85–90.

[3] *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, ed. E. Schwartz, ABAW.PH, n.f. 18, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1939, 72 (trans. taken from *On the Person of Christ: The Christology of Emperor Justinian*, trans. K. P. Wesche, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1991, 163).

summoned and met in Constantinople in 553.[4] One modern scholar calls it a reconciliation council that 'was a serious theological attempt to heal the schism on the basis of the common Cyrillian tradition which had been accepted at Ephesus and at Chalcedon'.[5] The council formed the ultimate triumph for Cyril and condemned the Three Chapters, that is, the person and work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the letter of Ibas of Edessa to Mari, and some of Theodoret of Cyrrhus' dogmatic writings, as the non-Chalcedonians had required from the Chalcedonians in the debate of 532/3.[6] Nevertheless the Second Council of Constantinople did not meet its goal—the unity of the church in East and West. It was gathered too late, thirty-five years too late.

If a council with the same agenda would have been gathered in 518, Justinian's uncle Justin would have faced strong resistance as well. Would Pope Hormisdas have been willing for the sake of union to agree to the terms on which Justin would have convoked the council? Could Severus have been persuaded to accept the Council of Chalcedon as such and Hormisdas to condemn the Three Chapters? The questions remain speculative, but a council in 518 would have had the advantage of not having to take into account thirty-five years of ecclesiastical estrangement, discrimination, and suffering on the side of the non-Chalcedonians that happened between 518 and 553.[7]

[4] The so-called Origenist controversy, which also played a role in the decade before the Council of Constantinople, cannot be discussed here; the Origenists were condemned in 553 by the summoned bishops in Constantinople but apparently not as part of the official 'ecumenical' council; see discussions in F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster i.W.: Aschendorff 1899; A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/2, Freiburg: Herder 1989, 403–30; K.-H. Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Aug.* 39 (1999), 5–83, especially 70–6.

[5] G. L. C. Frank, 'The Council of Constantinople II as a Model Reconciliation Council', *TS* 52 (1991), 636–50, here 647.

[6] S. Brock, 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 98ff., and see 116 (the debate focused around Theodoret and Ibas because they had played a role at Chalcedon; Theodore is not mentioned, but the opposition of the non-Chalcedonians to him was well established long before 532/3; see L. Abramowski, 'Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien', *ZKG* 67 (1955/6), 252–87).

Condemnation in 553: *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. i: *Nicaea to Lateran V*, ed. G. Alberigo *et al.*, trans. N. P. Tanner, London: Sheed & Ward 1990, 119–22.

[7] Already W. A. Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites*, London: Faith Press 1923, 129f., noted that schism could have been avoided if a theological solution like the one promoted by the Second Council of Constantinople would have been found

The Second Council of Constantinople did take place in 553, but because of the failed attempts at rapprochements and the ultimate condemnation of the non-Chalcedonians in 536, none of the non-Chalcedonians was either allowed or willing to take part in it. The absence of non-Chalcedonians on the one hand, and the vibrant repercussions of the condemnation of the Three Chapters in the West on the other hand, tempt church historians to discuss the council as a dogmatic problem between 'Western' Christendom, meaning the Latin tradition, and 'Eastern' Christendom, meaning the Greek tradition.[8] This obscures the fact that the path leading to it marks also a 'parting of the ways' between mainly European Chalcedonian and Near-Eastern, mainly non-Chalcedonian, Christendom.[9] In 553 the non-Chalcedonians no longer formed the main protagonists of the Christological quarrel although Justinian tried to gather them in Constantinople and have their leading representatives and intellectuals take part in the council. Therefore, the council and the decade preceding it illustrate that a definite separation between the non-Chalcedonians and (what would later be) European Christendom had taken place.[10] The conclusion here analyses how the non-Chalcedonians gained

earlier. Wigram, however, thought that these formulas needed to have been introduced already at Chalcedon in 451.

[8] For the strong resistance in the West and the surprisingly large survival of Latin treatises which condemn the decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople see W. Pewesin, *Imperium, Ecclesia universalis, Rom. Der Kampf der afrikanischen Kirche um die Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer 1937; R. Schieffer, 'Zur Beurteilung des norditalischen Dreikapitel-Schismas. Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie', *ZKG* 87 (1976), 167–201; R. Eno, 'Doctrinal Authority in the African Ecclesiology of the Sixth Century: Ferrandus and Facundus', *REAug* 22 (1976), 95–113; and P. Bruns, 'Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Die Haltung des Facundus von Hermiane und der nordafrikanische Kirche während des Drei-Kapitel-Streits (553)', *ZKG* 106 (1995), 151–78.

[9] Studying Christendom in the Near East redefines the terms 'Eastern' and 'Western' Christendom which are usually used to separate Greek and Latin Christianity. For the problem of the definition of 'East' and 'West' in a Mediterranean World see P. Brown, 'Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: A Parting of the Ways', in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, ed. D. Baker, Studies in Church History 13, Oxford: Blackwell 1976, 1–24. Brown refers back to Gibbon, who already pointed out the problem of defining 'East' and 'West'.

[10] As condemned heretics they could not have been the 'main protagonists' because they could not attend the council. Justinian probably hoped to have them (or at least a leading representative like Constantine of Laodicea) subscribe to his *Edict of the True Faith* before the council (and then take part in it) or subscribe to it afterwards. Neither happened, see below.

strength even after their condemnation in 536 by becoming a missionary church, how they located themselves within the Justinianic empire and its dogmatic politics and how their perception of the first half of the sixth century past became fundamental for the Syrian Orthodox until today.

JUSTINIAN AND THEOLOGY

Scholars often regard Justinian's way of dealing with church matters as ruthless because he dictated to the church what to believe. Especially the emperor's actions against Pope Vigilius in the 550s have been judged as a humiliation of the papacy.[11] It seems forgotten that the papacy's conduct in 536 had been a crushing defeat for the emperor's policy of rapprochement. Justinian had no means to stop the council of 536 from making a definite condemnation of the non-Chalcedonians. Chalcedon itself could no longer be questioned, Dioscorus could no longer be publicly proclaimed in the diptychs, and, by condemning the non-Chalcedonians and reintroducing the *libellus*, the council of 536 limited significantly the emperor's ability to make any concessions towards the non-Chalcedonians. The winner, especially the Western Chalcedonians and the pope, had no interest in reaching an agreement with the non-Chalcedonians. On the contrary, any compromise could endanger their (dogmatic) position. But Justinian, as emperor, certainly still cared to restore the unity of the Church. With Justinian's approval, Theodora stepped in and took over responsibilities for the non-Chalcedonians in and outside Constantinople. However, this could only be a temporary solution, and already before Theodora's death Justinian tried to find a way to unite the Church in his empire.[12] It seems that he decided

[11] J. Meyendorff, 'Justinian, the Empire and the Church', *DOP* 22 (1968), 43–60, especially 49 and 52. J. Speigl, 'Leo quem Vigilius condemnavit', in *Papsttum und Kirchenreform. Historische Beiträge. Festschrift für Georg Schwaiger zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Weitlauff and K. Hausberger, St. Ottilien: Eos 1990, 1–15, here 1. J. Moorhead, *Justinian*, London and New York: Longman 1994, 135.

[12] For the Chalcedonians' request to expel the non-Chalcedonian ascetics, see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 18, 683.

the only adequate way not to simply let matters go according to the desires of the papacy and the Chalcedonians but to play an active part in ecclesiastical politics was to usurp the field of theology for the emperor and institute himself as a theologian.

To regard Justinian as a theologian on the throne has been a long established assumption by scholars and has been renewed recently by Uthemann and Meier.[13] Justinian presented himself as the most Christian emperor, and theological treatises under his name written in the 540s and 550s have come down to us (especially the *Letter to the Monks of Alexandria against the Monophysites*, *Letter on the Three Chapters* and the *Edict on the True Faith*).[14] Whether Justinian can therefore be regarded as an able theologian of his time (which not only Greek Orthodox scholars like to think) or a dilettante as Eduard Schwartz puts it, is not of much concern here.[15] Rather crucial, however, is the question of why Justinian sat down and wrote theological edicts and letters. Is it right to assume that Justinian offers here his personal faith and forced this upon his subjects, or did his treatises rather remain functional, that is, did he write them because he wanted to reach a goal—the unity of the Church?

To say anything about anyone's personal faith remains almost impossible as long as this person did not write *Confessions* like Augustine or other personal and private treatises which cannot be regarded as concessions to any official function or public office the author held at the time. As discussed in Chapter 1, Justin did not become a Chalcedonian emperor because he was personally persuaded by the

[13] Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 5–83; M. Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2003. See also M. Clauss, 'Die συμφωνία von Staat und Kirche zur Zeit Justinians', in *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. K. Dietz, D. Henning, and H. Kaletsch, Würzburg: Selbstverlag 1993, 579–93.

[14] For an edition and translation of these works see n. 3. See also Jeffrey MacDonald, 'The Christological Works of Justinian', Ph.D. Thesis, Washington, DC 1995.

[15] For Justinian as a sound theologian see M. V. Anastos, 'The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *DOP* 6 (1951), 125–60; A. Gerostergios, *Justinian the Great: The Emperor and Saint*, Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 1982, especially 39–64; and recently also Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 48. For the view of him as a dilettante, see E. Schwartz, 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Iustinians', in SBAW.PH 2, Munich 1940, 33.

dyophysite Christology, but for *raisons d'état*. It would also be presumptuous to say anything about Justinian's or Theodora's personal faith. Severus' letter destroys the image of Theodora as the non-Chalcedonian 'believing queen' found in John of Ephesus. Similarly the image of Justinian as theologian on the throne remains highly questionable. Concerning the works that came down to us under Justinian's name, Jeffrey MacDonald points out their 'lack of interest in theological originality' and concludes that 'Justinian's authorship of these works should be understood as coordinating or endorsing the collection and composition done by a large staff rather than as his personally researching and writing the texts of these works.'[16] This fits the image of Justinian offered by the sources for the debate of 532/3 in Constantinople: the emperor could not present himself as an able theologian, but assembled able theologians at his court who discussed these highly technical matters for him.[17]

It cannot be excluded that Justinian had become a connoisseur of Christian discourses over the years and tried to force personal persuasions onto his subjects. However, it is more conclusive to regard his treatises first of all as works of a statesman who wished to reach a universally accepted dogma for the Christian *Oecumene* over which he ruled. Within a couple of weeks during the summer of 519, Justinian switched his dogmatic position from opposing the theopaschite formula to strongly encouraging Pope Hormisdas to accept it.[18] Obviously this could mean a speedy personal theological development, but it rather demonstrates Justinian's political far-sightedness that the theopaschite position could be useful. Similarly, political shrewdness should be assumed as the reason why Justinian presented himself as a theologian on the throne.

[16] MacDonald, 'The Christological Works of Justinian', 342. McDonald did not include the *Letter on the Three Chapters* in his study, but demonstrates in an appendix that this letter must be seen in the context of the *Edict on the True Faith*, and therefore, MacDonald's statement about the nature of Justinian's authorship is valid for this letter as well.

[17] Justinian's theological inability concerning the debate of 532/3 was stressed by Patrick Gray in his talk entitled 'The "Emperor-Theologian" at Work: Justinian at the Conversations of 532' given at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford in August 2003. See Chapter 1 n. 120.

[18] See Chapter 1.

The Christian transformation of the empire had been the dominant discourse already before Justinian but ecclesiastical politics became a top priority under his reign. Because of the non-acceptance of Chalcedon by many, the failure of the *Henoticon* as well as that of Justin's Chalcedonian revival, the non-Chalcedonian establishment of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and finally the failure of Justinian's policy of rapprochement, only a personal commitment of the emperor (and empress) held the centrifugal religious groups together. As Chalcedon had become the cornerstone of orthodoxy after 536, Justinian needed to modify 'orthodoxy' in order to reach an agreement between the opposing parties. He apparently took into account the experience of his predecessors in power and their never-ceasing problems with quarrels over dogmatic issues. If Justinian delegated the writing of debatable theological treatises to the patriarch of Constantinople, the patriarch would be put at risk of being condemned by other bishops—especially by the pope. In contrast to the pope, the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople was not beyond questioning and loyal Chalcedonian patriarchs of Constantinople who acted in concord with their emperor's dogmatic wishes had repeatedly failed to reach their goal—Acacius being the prime example.[19] However, Justinian could not simply issue a decree which defined orthodoxy if the bishops regarded him as a dilettante who intruded into their theological domain. But the complaints of Facundus, bishop of Hermiane in North Africa and one of Justinian's foremost opponents in the theological debate over the Three Chapters, that the emperor was surrounded by followers who would make Justinian believe that he 'surpassed all his predecessors in wisdom and faith, that no one among all the bishops of God, present as well as in the past, could be compared to him and that the Catholic faith stood firm in him alone and up to him' indicate that Justinian at least partially reached his goal.[20] By issuing theological

[19] Although officially the emperor Zeno issued the *Henoticon*, Acacius was the mind behind it and was made responsible for it; see Chapter 1 and especially A. Grillmeier, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol. ii/1, Freiburg: Herder, 2nd edn. 1991, 284–90.

[20] But the emperor could not deceive an able theologian like Facundus; see Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum Libri XII* XII.iv.14 (ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CChr.SL 90A, Turnhout: Brepols 1974, 392). For the date of this text see E. Chrysos, 'Zur Datierung und Tendenz der Werke des Facundus von Hermiane', *ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑ* 1 (1969), 311–23, who argues that the *defensio* was published in 550/1.

treatises in the 540s, Justinian instituted himself as a theological authority for all Christian groups with Theodora at his side as the patroness of the non-Chalcedonians. If Justinian could combine secular power with theological authority in one person, he might pave the way to a united church of the empire: instead of only reacting to the council of 536 and issuing the appropriate laws of condemnation, he decided to play an active role by moving the discussions from the division 'Chalcedonian—non-Chalcedonian' towards a modification of Chalcedon which hopefully would find a majority on both sides.[21]

JUSTINIAN AND JOHN OF EPHESUS

Justinian's religious policy after 536 looks inconsistent with his previous policy, but it hardly was. As the official doctrine of the church required him to defend Chalcedon against non-Chalcedonians, he acted accordingly by instituting a Chalcedonian patriarch in Alexandria in 537, condemning non-Chalcedonianism in 542/3 in his *Letter to the Monks of Alexandria against the Monophysites*, and declaring the canons of Chalcedon to be imperial law.[22] At the very same time, however, Justinian hosted and fed hundreds of non-Chalcedonian ascetics in Constantinople, certainly to the displeasure of the Chalcedonian clergy in and outside the capital.

[21] Already A. Grillmeier noted that Justinian's theological treatises called for a 'theologisch-terminologische Revision des Konzils von Chalkedon'; see. A. Grillmeier, 'Vorbereitung des Mittelalters. Eine Studie über das Verhältnis von Chalkedonismus und Neu-Chalkedonismus in der lateinischen Theologie von Boethius bis zu Gregor dem Großen', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 791–839, here 806.

[22] In the letter he also makes clear that any true Cyrillian should adhere to Chalcedon, at least an implicit invitation for all non-Chalcedonians to change their minds. MacDonald, 'The Christological Works of Justinian', 255 and 350, argues that Justinian emphasized Cyril less in this letter than in his other treatises, where he refers to the suffering of the Logos. However, Justinian's many references to Cyril in the *Letter to the Monks of Alexandria against the Monophysites* demonstrate that also here he tried to demonstrate the Cyrillian basis of his argument.

Chalcedon as law: *Novella* 131, chapter 1 from 545 (*Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. iii: *Novellae*, ed. R. Schoell, Berlin: Weidmann 1904, 654f.).

John of Ephesus' account of his non-Chalcedonian saints in Constantinople might historically not always be accurate, but his description of the work of religious groups and especially their lobbying at court after 536 very likely has truth in it. One of John's episodes illustrates Justinian's difficult policy of ambiguity nicely: because of the 'great disturbance' in matters of faith, the non-Chalcedonian ascetic Mara the Solitary came to Constantinople after 536 in order to inform the imperial couple about his perspective on this issue. He used 'insulting words' and behaved contemptuously towards Justinian and Theodora but they accepted his *parrhesia*, his freedom of speech, and tolerated his insults.[23] They tried to accommodate him in Constantinople as well as they had done for all other non-Chalcedonian ascetics in the capital and honoured him, according to John of Ephesus, as a (non-Chalcedonian) saint, a 'spiritual philosopher' as people said.

Justinian honoured not only 'professionals' of faith, but also 'common people' like non-Chalcedonian shipowners whom he invited to discuss matters of faith with him in Constantinople.[24] Similarly he also gathered other groups, probably not only non-Chalcedonians, in Constantinople, accommodated them generously, and conceded them personal attention. By asking the non-Chalcedonian ascetics for their blessings, the emperor indicated that he regarded them as true athletes of the Christian faith.[25]

By patronizing non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople, mainly through his wife Theodora, Justinian could only gain. The discussions with these groups gave the emperor a chance to understand the conditions under which the heterodox would be willing to come to terms with the Chalcedonians—information which Justinian might have used for the preparation of the theological treatises or even for the preparation of the Second Council of Constantinople. Neither Justinian nor Theodora could abrogate the definite condemnation of the non-Chalcedonians. However, they could give them the impression that the interests of every Christian party were taken seriously

[23] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 36, in *PO* 18, 630.

[24] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 136–8 (Harrak, 131f.) for 559/60. The date, however, is wrong. Later the chronicle narrates that these groups of believers enjoyed the care of Theodora, which means these groups came to Constantinople before 548.

[25] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 18, 680.

and that they still belonged to Byzantium (and were not just outlaws!). Therefore ruling as emperor after 536 was a delicate and sensitive matter. Religious dissent simultaneously made Justinian (and Theodora) more than ever the focus of the opposing Christian groups and the centre of the empire.

Besides hosting non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople, the emperor favoured a group of non-Chalcedonians around John of Ephesus in Asia Minor by financially supporting their mission(s) to the pagans, probably some time after 541/2.[26] There could be a number of reasons why Justinian supported very generously non-Chalcedonian missions in Asia Minor. It might have been that the plague (which hit Justinian himself) induced the emperor to doubt the course of his religious policy, and by financing non-Chalcedonian missionaries the emperor might have hoped to pacify God's wrath.[27] However, it might be more worthwhile to search for a secular reason than to assume a metaphysical motivation.[28]

[26] *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933, 77f. (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775*, trans. A. Harrak, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies 1999, 92f.); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.24; *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, ed. and trans. J.-B. Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901, 287f. (207f.). John also converted Montanists in southern Asia Minor; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.33, Chabot, 323–5 (269–71); see S. Gero, 'Montanus and Montanism according to a Medieval Syriac Source', *JThS* n.s. 28 (1977), 520–4. For the following see V. Menze, 'Johannes von Ephesus und Kaiser Justinian: ein Missionar, sein Patron und eine Heidenmission in Kleinasien des 6. Jahrhunderts', in E. Winter (ed.), *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Kleinasien in der Antike. Festschrift für Elmar Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag*, Asia Minor Studien 65, Bonn: Habelt (forthcoming 2008).

[27] For Justinian suffering from the plague, see Procopius, *Anecdota* IV.1, Dewing, 42f. Moorhead, *Justinian*, 100. For the Justinianic plague, see D. Ch. Stathakopoulos, *Famine and Pestilence in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Empire: A Systematic Survey of Subsistence Crises and Epidemics*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2004, 110–54.

[28] Several scholars have worked on John's missions before: see I. Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Strukturanalyse byzantinischer Mission zur Zeit Justins und Justinians*, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie 1974, 12–22a; F. R. Trombley, 'Paganism in the Greek World at the End of Antiquity: The Case of Rural Anatolia and Greece', *HTR* 78 (1985), 327–52; Michael Whitby, 'John of Ephesus and the Pagans: Pagan Survivals in the Sixth Century', in *Paganism in the Later Roman Empire and in Byzantium*, ed. Maciej Salamon, Cracow: Universitas 1991, 111–31; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, vol. ii: *The Rise of the Church*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993, 118f.

The fact is that Justinian, not Theodora, and several high-ranking non-Chalcedonian individuals sponsored this mission.[29] John, along with varying non-Chalcedonian friends, undertook this task in southern Asia Minor, in Asia, Caria, Lydia, and Phrygia. He built almost one hundred churches and a dozen monasteries, and converted 70,000 or 80,000 pagans.[30] It is also likely that John's missionary activities took almost half of his lifetime, probably around thirty-five years.[31] It was therefore not one mission. John must have undertaken several campaigns in southern Asia Minor, interrupted by years in which he lived in Constantinople or travelled to the East. More difficulties exist for defining John's ecclesiastical position at this time as well as for explaining why John chose southern Asia Minor for his missionary activities, and what motivated Justinian to support this non-Chalcedonian mission.

Beginning with the latter, Justinian paid money to have people baptized, to build churches, and even gave each convert a 'conversion bonus'. However, 'there is no clear reference to an official appointment' of John of Ephesus by Justinian, although some scholars have assumed that.[32] Michael the Syrian states that because Justinian sponsored the mission, the pagans 'were instructed according to the Chalcedonian doctrine; because the saint [John of Ephesus] thought it to be right that they were instructed by his hands, [and] that it was advantageous that they leave the error of paganism even if [it were] for Chalcedonianism'.[33] Susan Ashbrook Harvey doubts this

[29] For the non-Chalcedonian patrons see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 55 and 57, in *PO* 19, 192–6 and 204.

[30] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 77 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin*, Harrak, 92); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.24; Chabot, 287f. (207f.). For John's fellows see Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz*, 19–21; a discussion of the number of converted pagans can be found in Trombley, 'Paganism in the Greek World at the End of Antiquity', 330f. and Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, 118f.

[31] When John wrote his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* in 565/6 he speaks of thirty years (both dates: *PO* 18, 680f.); in the third part of his *Church History* he speaks of thirty-five years (*HE* III.2.44). Although this passage cannot be dated, John might have still been in Asia Minor for missionary activities as late as 571/2. See below n. 42.

[32] Most recently this assumption was reiterated by S. Mitchell, *A History of the Later Roman Empire AD 284–641: The Transformation of the Ancient World*, Oxford: Blackwell 2007, 130; J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium', Diss. Groningen 1995, 30 n. 34, rightly remarks that 'there is no clear reference to an official appointment'.

[33] Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.24; Chabot, 287f. (207).

as John 'can hardly have served the Chalcedonian interests of the government', and Jan van Ginkel insists that John's 'activities were probably not detrimental to the Monophysites' cause'.[34] Considering John's outstanding reputation among the Syrian Orthodox in the 550s and 560s, which is affirmed by independent documentation, it would indeed require more evidence before one assumes that John had switched sides.[35] It is also unlikely that the plague—which reached its peak in Constantinople around 542 and therefore may have happened at the same time as John left for Asia Minor—persuaded a non-Chalcedonian to instruct pagans in a 'heretical' doctrine.[36] John said that the pagans he converted 'enlightened their intelligence with the truth', which he hardly would have said if he taught them the Chalcedonian doctrine.[37] Should Michael the Syrian's statement, therefore, be dismissed?

In the light of the fierce Christological debate at the time of John and Justinian—in which the laity had to learn from hagiography (like John Rufus' *Plerophoriae*) that only the adherence to the 'orthodox' understanding of Christ would grant them to salvation—Michael's explanation does not make any sense![38] Furthermore, if Justinian's primary goal was to have pagans converted to Chalcedonianism, he no doubt could have found Chalcedonian missionaries and did not need to rely on John and his fellow non-Chalcedonians. Therefore, it seems likely that Michael inserted this explanation in order to make the strange arrangement between a Chalcedonian emperor and a non-Chalcedonian monk understandable for himself as well as his readers.[39]

[34] S. Ashbrook Harvey, *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and* The Lives of the Eastern Saints, Berkeley: University of California Press 1990, 29; van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 31f.

[35] John's outstanding position becomes visible in non-Chalcedonian documents where he signed letters directly after the bishops Jacob Baradaeus and Theodora, see van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 33 with n. 54. Furthermore, his background as monk from Amida would speak against his betrayal of the non-Chalcedonian cause.

[36] For the date of John's missionary activities see below. For the plague as a turning event in Justinian's reign see Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*, 373–86. John was an eyewitness of the plague in Constantinople; see the discussion in van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 30f.

[37] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 77 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin*, Harrak, 92).

[38] Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz*, 16f.

[39] The *Chronicle of Zuqnin* does not recall this arrangement between John and Justinian.

A better explanation might be found if the question of motivation is approached from the other end, from John of Ephesus' point of view. Why did he convert pagans and why in southern Asia Minor? As John was in the capital around 535/6 it could have been that John was inspired by Zooras, the Syrian non-Chalcedonian Stylite who baptized well-to-do Constantinopolitans at this time.[40] It might even be that Justinian actually allowed non-Chalcedonians to convert pagans as part of his policy of rapprochement at this time. He certainly allowed John of Ephesus in the 540s to persecute pagans in the capital.[41] John probably started his missionary activities in Asia Minor 541/2 and continued with them—interrupted by stays in Constantinople—until at least 571/2.[42]

Why then Caria, Asia, Lydia, and Phrygia? He knew the area because he accompanied John of Hephaestu on his travels there, and assisted him in handing out the Eucharist to the faithful and

[40] For the date, see van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 29; for Zooras see Chapters 4 and 5.

[41] Van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 32.

[42] 541/2 is the date given by the *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, but in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* John mentions in a passage dated to 565/6 that he started his missions thirty years before, i.e., *c.*535/6; John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 47, in *PO* 18, 680f. See also John of Ephesus, *HE* III.2.44, where he speaks of thirty-five years of mission. As John also misdated the date of Justinian's death to 572/3 (if this passage in the *Chronicle of Zuqnin* is based on John's second part of his *Church History*), he might have been off again for the dating of his own missionary activities by around six to seven years, which would provide us with the date as given in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints*; Michael the Syrian dates the start of John's missionary activities to the fifteenth year of the reign of Justinian. See Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.24 (Chabot, 287 (207)).

Concerning the continuation until at least 571/2: In *HE* III.3.37 John speaks of the 'sixth year' and mentioned the emperor 'Justin' (in abbreviated form). Usually editors and translators 'correct' this to 'Justinian' although W. Cureton, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1853, 210, edited 'Justin'. There is no logical connection between the 'sixth year' and the name of the emperor, and R. Payne Smith in his translation *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1860, 232, reads here 'the sixth year from its [the monastery's] commencement' and 'Justinian'. But can it not refer to the sixth year of the reign of Justin II, i.e., 571/2? John must have already been bishop of Ephesus at this point (i.e. the text refers to the time after 558), otherwise he could hardly have been charged with taking over the episcopal church in Tralles as the story implies. See *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia*, ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, CSCO 105, 106, Paris 1935–6 [reprint: Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq 1952], 171 (127); and *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, trans. J. M. Schönfelder, Munich: Henter'sche Buchhandlung 1862, 134.

ordaining non-Chalcedonians in Tralles in 541. According to John's account in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints* the bishop

> made more than fifty priests. Since we were a large party, and there were distinguished gentlemen among us, we were given permission to occupy an upper space, in the upper *catechumenia* of the church; and so they would come up there three and five at a time, while men stood at the doors and kept watch, and men who arranged these and sent them on, and this while I myself was carrying the oblation and the sacrament, and he was standing and blessing and administering the oblation and dismissing them, and those below were performing the service.[43]

As John of Tella ordained John of Ephesus deacon in 529, this passage is usually regarded as indicating that John was still only a deacon at this point, not a priest.[44] However, if John is considered a deacon in 541, it would pose a serious obstacle to his missionary activities starting shortly afterwards: he could not have administered any sacraments like the Eucharist for example—a deacon was not even allowed to baptize.[45] How would John be able to do any basic missionary work, not to mention the building of almost a hundred churches of which John boasted?

It might be worth re-evaluating this passage from John's *Lives of the Eastern Saints*: it remains unclear whether the group of persons who were ordained and the group that was handed out the Eucharist and received blessings were identical. John of Ephesus' writing style is sometimes confusing, and about his episcopal ordination he speaks of Jacob Baradaeus and his episcopal companions who 'ordained four bishops in Asia, one in Ephesus a man whose name was John the Syrian, the converter of the pagans'.[46] Obviously, he meant himself, although he usually speaks about himself in the first person, and shortly afterwards in the account he fell back into the first person.

[43] Johannes von Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 25, in *PO* 18, 538.

[44] See Brooks' notes in *PO* 18, 538, on date and John's ecclesiastical position. Taken over by van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 30.

[45] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 3, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, ed. and trans. A. Vööbus, CSCO 367, 368, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1975, 163 (157). The text was written by non-Chalcedonian bishops in 532–4; see A. Vööbus, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde*, vol. i, CSCO 307, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1970, 167–75 and Chapter 4.

[46] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 50, in *PO* 19, 157.

Therefore it is possible to suggest that the group of fifty persons who were ordained and the 'we'-group to which John of Ephesus certainly belonged were the same, and it can be assumed that John of Hephaestu made him priest in 541. It establishes John of Ephesus' ecclesiastical career as follows: ordained deacon by John of Tella in 529, ordained priest by John of Hephaestu in 541 and ordained bishop by Jacob Baradaeus in 558.[47]

Regarding John as a priest, ordained in Tralles, explains then why John returned and began his missionary activities there among pagans in 541/2. John of Hephaestu might have ordained him priest specifically for Tralles, and John considered it his duty to take up his ecclesiastical position in the parish he was ordained for (although not the church—as it was probably occupied by the Chalcedonians). If this was the case it also becomes obvious why the centre of John's missionary activity in southern Asia Minor seems to have been the region around Tralles.[48]

As priest, John was still not allowed to consecrate any church or altar, as only bishops were allowed to do this. The crucial issue was the consecration of the altar, the throne of Christ and of the Holy Spirit—all other sacramental tasks for consecrating a church might have been performed by a priest in exceptional circumstances, such as times of persecution.[49] In other words, John needed a bishop to supply him with consecrated altars in order to use a new church canonically. John could hardly rely on support from local Chalcedonian bishops, but

[47] Otherwise the problem arises of finding a time and a person who ordained John priest before his episcopal ordination.

[48] According to John of Ephesus, *HE* III.3.37 (*Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia*, Brooks, 171 (127) and *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, Schönfelder, 134), one quarter of all churches John built in Asia Minor were in the vicinity of Tralles. Furthermore John built there a monastery which seems to have been important enough that the bishop of Tralles tried to take it over. Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz*, 17f., regards this monastery as John's 'Ausgangsbasis', but for a possible (later) date of this passage see n. 42.

[49] *Chapters which were Written from the Orient* 5, 8, and 12, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 164–6 (158f.). The still fundamental study for the altar is J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, vol. i, Munich: Alte Meister Guenther Koch & Co 1924; for the consecration of the altar see 663–76, especially 669f., but without knowledge of the Syriac sources; see also F. J. Dölger, 'Die Heiligkeit des Altars und ihre Begründung im christlichen Altertum', *AuC* 2 (1930), 161–83, and J. P. Kirsch and Th. Klauser, 'Altar III (christlich)', *RAC* 1 (1950), 334–54, especially 349–53.

John of Hephaestu could have sent him some of his already anointed altars, or Jacob Baradaeus helped John after Jacob was ordained bishop in 542/3, 'fully carrying out the ministry of the priesthood in all the countries from the royal city as far as the sea-coast of Lycaonia'.[50] John of Ephesus could have stored the altars until the churches for which he needed them were completed.[51] In order to build almost a hundred churches and a dozen monasteries, John of Ephesus had been in Asia Minor for decades, and only since *c.*558 was he able to fulfil episcopal duties. Until then, all of his churches must have been officially under Chalcedonian jurisdiction, although local Chalcedonian bishops probably had difficulties in controlling every church in their dioceses.[52]

Missions and the construction of churches obviously cost money, of which John apparently had more than enough. In the part of his *Church History* which deals with his missionary work, John states that the emperor paid for the 'expenses and instruments of baptism' and that 'fifty-five [out of almost one hundred] churches were built from the public treasury', for which also 'silver vessels, woollen clothing, books and copper in abundance' were provided.[53] In the *Lives of the Eastern Saints* he notes in two saints' lives that Theodore, the emperor's former chamberlain, and Sosiana, the chamberlain of the patrician Caesaria, provided him also with ample supplies for his missions.[54] Now, how do imperial Chalcedonian and individual non-Chalcedonian patronage fit together?

Justinian's legislation shows no special concern for paganism, but reiterates and renews prohibitions against pagans.[55] The only large-

[50] For the altars anointed by John of Hephaestu see Chapter 5; for Jacob Baradaeus see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 50, in *PO* 19, 155. For the date of Jacob's ordination, see D. D. Bundy, 'Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources and a New Approach', *Muséon* 91 (1978), 45–86, here 78f.

[51] There seems to have been a real trade in altars; see John of Tella, *Questions and Answers* 43, 46, and 47, in *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, Vööbus, 220f. (204f.).

[52] As Chalcedonian bishops certainly had in the patriarchate of Antioch; see Chapter 4. However, it could be that Justinian also supported John against claims by local bishops. Scholars usually regard *HE* III.3.37 as an example of Justinian's support against the bishop of Tralles, but see n. 42 above.

[53] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 77f. (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin*, Harrak, 92f.).

[54] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 55 and 57 in *PO* 19, 192–6 and 204.

[55] For persecutions of pagans under Justinian see K. L. Noethlichs, 'Heidenverfolgung', *RAC* 13 (1986), 1149–90, especially 1169–71, and K. L. Noethlichs, 'Iustinianus (Kaiser)', *RAC* 19 (2001), 668–763, especially 739f.

scale missions known from Justinian's reign remain John of Ephesus', and it seems difficult to justify the emperor as their promoter. If the emperor intended to start a crusade against paganism he could have found Chalcedonian missionaries. Furthermore, if Justinian initiated John of Ephesus' missions it seems hard to explain why no other source but John of Ephesus even mentions them. A Chalcedonian outcry should be expected, and rather balanced sources like Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor or Evagrius Scholasticus would be likely to mention missionary activities against pagans if they had been high on Justinian's political agenda. As this is not the case, the missions seem to be a rather personal undertaking of John of Ephesus, and probably at the beginning sponsored exclusively by non-Chalcedonian faithful.

If these suggestions are correct, a picture of the 540s emerges in which Justinian was confronted with a non-Chalcedonian mission against paganism supported by influential non-Chalcedonians. He obviously had the option to suppress John's activity, but experience must have told him that coercive measures should not be his first choice. Furthermore, even if Chalcedonians would have appreciated that Justinian kept non-Chalcedonianism at bay, he would have antagonized influential non-Chalcedonian individuals, of whom one at least had been a high-ranking official at his court. Forcing influential patrons to stop sponsoring Christian missions would have hardly fit the image of the most Christian emperor that Justinian wished to establish.[56] Furthermore, what John's 'private' mission had accomplished so far would have been credited to the non-Chalcedonian party only, and the emperor could be charged by the non-Chalcedonians with protection of paganism. He therefore chose another option. He usurped the patronage and presented himself as promoter of Christianity beyond doctrinal boundaries.

This might have been easier than it looks at first sight. The Chalcedonians represented the church of the empire and were in a more comfortable position than the non-Chalcedonians to undertake missions. However, they apparently remained inactive in promoting the Christian faith.[57] Therefore they could now hardly blame

[56] Meier, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*, 106–8.

[57] At least this is the picture in the surviving sources. Maybe some Chalcedonian bishops also took care of missionary activities in their dioceses at this time, but no account of it survives.

the emperor for supporting the spread of Christendom even though non-Chalcedonians had set this process in motion. This might also be the reason why not Theodora, but Justinian himself, deliberately took over the patronage. The emperor thereby could prevent further alienation of non-Chalcedonians from his reign by establishing ties with some non-Chalcedonians. It gave him a chance to create loyalties directly to himself rather than through Theodora, but at the same time he did not compromise his Chalcedonian rule.

John of Ephesus did not mind the emperor's concerns. For him, imperial support was more than welcome as it not only facilitated his missions, but certainly also brought him the respect of his fellow non-Chalcedonians. Not a bishop, but a priest, forced the emperor to support a non-Chalcedonian undertaking, and the mission itself earned him—as he proudly announced—the nicknames 'converter of pagans' and 'destroyer of idols'.[58] In the end Jacob Baradaeus rewarded him with the metropolitan see of Ephesus.[59]

Imperial support almost certainly outweighed the initial individual non-Chalcedonian support by far, and it is therefore somehow justified that John does not mention the non-Chalcedonian support at all in his *Church History*. However, it was certainly John's pride to claim in his *Church History* that through his missionary activities the 'grace of God visited the territories of Asia, Caria, Lydia and Phrygia, through the zeal of Justinian [...] [and] emanated from him in abundance through the mediation of our humble self'.[60] Thereby John placed himself in the service of the empire and presented his work as being in the public interest. In the thirteenth century, the Syrian Orthodox Maphrian (metropolitan bishop) Barhebraeus even remembered John, stating that ' "I was [employed] in his [Justinian's] business for thirty years, and I never saw him cease from the building of churches." '[61]

[58] Van Ginkel, *John of Ephesus*, 31 n. 41.

[59] And, according to *HE* 3.37, John seems to have been in his diocese at least part-time and exercised ecclesiastical power over other churches and bishops.

[60] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 77 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin*, Harrak, 92).

[61] *The Chronography of Gregory Abû'l Faraj, the son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus*, ed. and trans. Ernest A. Wallis Budge, London: Oxford University Press 1931, 79 (74).

Both Justinian and John, with very different intentions, profited from their joined effort against pagans, and this probably led to a privileged relationship between John and his patron Justinian. It also explains why John commemorated Justinian—at least in his *Church History*—as orthodox, before the emperor became a Julianist at the very end of his life.[62] For Justinian, John's missions gave the emperor a chance to remind the Chalcedonians that non-Chalcedonianism did not vanish through the mere condemnation of non-Chalcedonians in 536. The council of 536, with which the Chalcedonians reached their peak of power in Constantinople, had confirmed the Chalcedonian outlook of the empire, but had not worked for a Christian unity within the empire. John's activities now gave the emperor the opportunity to support and thereby strengthen the non-Chalcedonians. Justinian hoped that this would make Chalcedonians more willing to follow the emperor's search for a compromise.

JUSTINIAN AND THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (553)

At the same time as Justinian declared the ecclesiastical canons of the Council of Chalcedon to be state law, the emperor started to redefine the Council of Chalcedon through the condemnation of the Three Chapters (544/5).[63] Maybe not the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but certainly the condemnation of Ibas' letter to Mari and of some of Theodoret's dogmatic writings touched a sensitive subject: Chalcedon had rehabilitated Ibas and Theodoret, and to condemn parts of their writings undermined the ecumenical status

[62] *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 144 (*The Chronicle of Zuqnin*, Harrak, 136). But see also J. van Ginkel, 'John of Ephesus on Emperors: The Perception of the Byzantine Empire by a Monophysite', in *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992*, OCA 247, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1994, 323–33, here 326f.

[63] For a detailed theological discussion of Justinian's steps that led to the Second Council of Constantinople see Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 48–76.

of the council in the eyes especially of western Chalcedonians. For the non-Chalcedonians, however, the council's rehabilitation of Ibas and of Theodoret was one of the main reasons they rejected it, and their first complaint about Chalcedon in the debate of 532/3.[64] Already then, the emperor had offered them as a concession that they could anathematize Ibas, Theodoret, and also Theodore if they accepted Chalcedon and the *libellus*.[65] Now Justinian forced this reinterpretation of Chalcedon upon the Chalcedonians as well and made this revised orthodoxy binding for all Christians. Thereby Justinian leaves no doubt about his intentions to play an active role in defining orthodoxy, and presents his initiative as a clear signal for a new attempt at reconciling the non-Chalcedonians to Chalcedon.

The condemnation of the Three Chapters caused strong opposition among the bishops in the West to which Justinian replied with harsh words in his *Letter on the Three Chapters* (possibly written 549/50). The emperor's attitude towards Pope Vigilius became offensive, but Justinian knew that papal consent was crucial for any far-reaching decision in doctrinal matters. The Acacian schism that ended with the accession of Justin was certainly still present on the minds of the rulers in Constantinople: emperors and patriarchs had desperately tried to come to terms with the non-Chalcedonians but had failed to include the papacy in their religious policy. If a unification of the churches in East and West should be achieved, Justinian could not make this mistake of leaving out the West again. As he had little success in persuading the western bishops and the pope that the condemnation of the Three Chapters was a doctrinal necessity, the emperor forced the pope to accept the condemnation after the Second Council of Constantinople. That the ultimate outcome of the council was nevertheless a failure was not due to the uproar in the West but because the East did not share the emperor's vision of a unified church.

[64] Brock, 'Conversations', 98f.

[65] In 532/3 Justinian seems to have conceded to the non-Chalcedonians even the right to anathematize the *personae* Ibas and Theodoret. To what extent other issues—like Theodore Askidas and the Origenist controversy—played a role, cannot be discussed here: see P. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden: Brill 1979, 61–8; Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', 60–4.

Justinian had not patronized non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople and John of Ephesus in Asia Minor out of good will. The emperor probably intended to create a 'special relationship' on which he could count and call in favours in return. In 549 only the archbishop of Prima Justiniana supported Justinian's Three-Chapters policy while all other Illyrian bishops solidly opposed the emperor. As already Robert Markus remarked, this was hardly a coincidence. Justinian had a little more than a decade ago given the bishop of Prima Justiniana, his birthplace in Dardania, metropolitan rights and made him the archbishop over the northern Illyrian provinces. Considering these far-reaching privileges granted by Justinian, it was probably an easy decision for the archbishop to now show Justinian his loyalty even if he might not have agreed with the emperor's religious policy.[66]

John of Ephesus, however, disappointed the emperor. When Theodora died in 548 and the non-Chalcedonians lost their official patroness at court, Justinian requested co-operation from John of Ephesus. He wished to send him on a mission to the East and ask leading non-Chalcedonians to gather again in Constantinople for a discussion of faith.[67] However, John refused to 'serve as intermediary and officer of this operation' because he feared the reactions of his fellow-monks if he showed allegiance with his patron. The emperor also had no success in persuading the non-Chalcedonian intellectual John Philoponus to leave Alexandria and come to Constantinople for the council.[68]

Justinian was nevertheless able to gather 400 leading non-Chalcedonians in Constantinople. Considering Justinian's difficulties in finding an intermediary, and the fact that the non-Chalcedonian monks and especially archimandrites in the East probably discussed the matter among themselves before reaching the decision to make

[66] R. A. Markus, 'Carthage—Prima Justiniana—Ravenna: An Aspect of Justinian's *Kirchenpolitik*', *Byz.* 49 (1979), 289–92, 301. See also J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 [reprint Rome: di Bretschneider 1967], 385–400, and B. Granić, 'Die Gründung des autokephalen Erzbistums von Justiniana Prima durch Justinian I im Jahre 535 n. Chr.', *Byz.* 2 (1925), 123–40, especially 136–8; C. S. Snively, 'Iustiniana Prima (Caričin Grad)', *RAC* 19 (2001), 638–68.

[67] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 139f. (Harrak, 133); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, Chabot, 312 (248).

[68] For him see below.

their way to Constantinople, several years must have elapsed before they arrived in Constantinople.[69] At that point Justinian had come closer to reaching a solution than one might think when taking into account only the outcome of 553. In around 551–3 the emperor had gathered in his capital loyal eastern Chalcedonian bishops, the pope, and 400 non-Chalcedonians, among them Constantine, the metropolitan of Laodicea and highest authority among the non-Chalcedonians from the patriarchate of Antioch.[70] Pope Vigilius was in a less comfortable position than Agapetus in 536 when Justinian needed to defend his support of Anthimus and the pope mercilessly stopped the emperor's policy of rapprochement. Now Justinian held the superior position and was willing to use his power to bring about a compromise between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians. But while Vigilius finally submitted to Justinian, Constantine, and with him the emperor's hope to have someone from the pre-518 non-Chalcedonian hierarchy to accept his compromise, died just at that moment when Justinian tried to force him to subscribe.[71] Any details are unfortunately lost, but Justinian probably hoped to have Constantine subscribe to a statement which would clear him from any non-Chalcedonian 'heresy' before the council met. This subscription would allow the metropolitan to take part in the council and accept it—*pars pro toto* as the head of the Eastern non-Chalcedonian hierarchy.[72]

The sentence that 'it is impossible that anything whatever will be done [for a change of the religious policy] by those who are in power', which John of Ephesus put into Severus' mouth for 535/6, became true for 553.[73] The compromise which Justinian had sought for the

[69] Whether Jacob Baradaeus and maybe a few other non-Chalcedonian bishops had a word in it is not known, but it is likely.

[70] John of Hephaestu in his canons named Constantine as the bishop who took over Severus' place; see F. Nau, 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', *ROC* 14 (1909), 49.

[71] Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, Chabot, 312f. (249f.); *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 110f. (Harrak, 114). Although both sources are not entirely clear about the date and to what Constantine was forced to subscribe, it refers in all likelihood to the Second Council of Constantinople; see E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951, 36f.

[72] Theodosius, the non-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria in exile, remained for unknown reasons in the background.

[73] John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 48, in *PO* 18, 687, wrote these lines safely after Justinian's death.

council might have worked in 518, but certainly not in 553. The generation of non-Chalcedonians in 553 could not justify an acceptance of Justinian's compromise even on the basis of the theopaschite formula and the condemnation of the Three Chapters. From the non-Chalcedonian perspective, the Second Council of Constantinople could not match the First Council of Constantinople in 381. The council of 381 not only finally overthrew the 'Arian heresy', and thereby the heresy which had been in power for the last fifty years, but also profoundly recalled the sufferings of the Nicene fathers.[74] Justinian's compromise, however, neither overthrew and condemned the individuals who had made the non-Chalcedonians suffer, nor did it honour the brave resistance of the non-Chalcedonians against popes and emperors. The council, after all, stood on the basis of the council of 451 and especially the *libellus* (although Vigilius represented the papacy as less immaculate than Hormisdas had imagined it in his *libellus*), the abandonment of which the revered non-Chalcedonian saints like Severus or John of Tella had sought their whole life. The non-Chalcedonians would have felt it as betrayal of their heritage and also of their own personal sufferings if they now agreed to Justinian's terms. Therefore, this council which had been Justinian's hope for a unity of his church of the empire also finally ended the non-Chalcedonian hopes to overthrow the Chalcedonians under this emperor.

Furthermore, the non-Chalcedonians had also gained strength in the decade before the council of 553. In Constantinople they were officially protected by Theodora, and even the emperor assured them now and then of his affection. However, especially outside the capital the non-Chalcedonian advancement is noticeable. After John of Tella's mass ordinations in the 520s, followed by John of Hephaestu's ordinations, non-Chalcedonianism seemed to be thriving. The non-Chalcedonian bishops wrote canons which advised the clergy how to lead their local communities. Thousands of priests ordained by John of Tella and possibly supplied with altars by John of Hephaestu could establish eucharistic communities and thereby make *the* Church in

[74] As it was visible for everyone who wished to know in the letter put up in front of the decrees of this council, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. i: *Nicaea to Lateran V*, Alberigo and Tanner, 25–30.

the sense of de Lubac. Not the Chalcedonian, but the non-Chalcedonian priests felt the need to evangelize the countryside and bring new converts into the church.

This strength at the 'ground' made leading non-Chalcedonians hesitant to look out for compromises to which they could not wholeheartedly agree. The strong foundation of the church on the ground in combination with the failure of the Council of Constantinople in 553 called for the enthronement of ecclesiastical leaders. A couple of years after the council, Jacob Baradaeus started the ordination of a non-Chalcedonian episcopal hierarchy which not only included John of Ephesus, as a reward for his outstanding missionary work, but also two patriarchs, 26 bishops and around 100,000 lower clerics.[75]

CONCLUSION: SUBSEQUENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX SCHISM

The year 553 marks a turning-point for Chalcedonians in East and West. Some western Chalcedonians saw Pope Leo condemned by this council—and even worse: by one of his own successors, Pope Vigilius.[76] Eastern Chalcedonians regarded the council as the final triumph of Cyril. Thus both groups saw the council as referring to the fifth century past and regarded this past as either uprooted or confirmed. For the Syrian Orthodox, 553 did not change the way they perceived the past at all. They merely received a confirmation that Chalcedon itself could no longer be questioned even under an emperor who wished to find a compromise.

This explains why the post-553 non-Chalcedonian historiographical accounts of the Second Council of Constantinople remain

[75] The exact dates for Jacob's ordinations are unknown, but as John of Ephesus mentions as Jacob's first ordination (after ordaining two monks in Egypt as bishops in order to have two fellow-bishops who were needed for any canonical ordination) the ordination of a metropolitan of Laodicea, it seems valid to assume that this was done after Constantine of Laodicea's death in 553; see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 50, in *PO* 19, 156–8. See also above.

[76] Speigl, 'Leo quem Vigilius condemnavit'.

strangely dispassionate. The only contemporary non-Chalcedonian who took an interest in the outcome of the council was the Alexandrian intellectual John Philoponus, whom Justinian had invited to take part in the council.[77] However, like other non-Chalcedonians John did not yield to Justinian's request and abstained from it. His irenic attitude towards the council promptly switched in the aftermath when he realized that Chalcedon was not abandoned.

The Syrian historiographical accounts remain brief: Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor heard of the council, but knows hardly anything about its purpose.[78] He recorded that a military commander in the East, a *dux*, and two Chalcedonian clergymen together tried to persuade non-Chalcedonian priests, monks, and laypersons to accept the council.[79] Ps.-Dionysius, probably using John of Ephesus, acknowledges the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and states that on the one hand the council caused a great uproar in the West, and on the other hand was called the fifth ecumenical council.[80] He concedes that it 'settled many issues', but the statement 'it was not acceptable to everyone' sounds so impersonal, as if the council convened by the emperor did not concern the non-Chalcedonians at all. Michael the Syrian added the chapters of the council for which again John of Ephesus' lost second part of his *Church History* seems to be the likely source.[81]

No outraged cry against Justinian's daring step to establish himself as a theologian survives. The ecclesiastical manœuvres of the emperor-theologian, who called for an ecumenical council and forced the papacy to accept its decisions although the Chalcedonians in the West did not consent, hardly found any repercussions in non-Chalcedonian circles. John of Ephesus and Ps.-Zachariah wrote about the council at a time when the Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians coexisted peacefully

[77] See U. M. Lang, 'John Philoponus and the Fifth Ecumenical Council: A Study and Translation of the *Letter to Justinian*', *AHC* 37 (2005), 411–36 (I am grateful to the author for supplying me with an offprint); see also Lang's study *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the* Arbiter, Leuven: Peeters 2001.

[78] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *HE* XII.6, Brooks, 201f. (Brooks, 136f.; Hamilton and Brooks, 323–5);

[79] Again, the area of Amida was one of the prime targets. The non-Chalcedonian monasteries here, which had suffered so much in the early reign of Justinian, seem to have flourished again at this time.

[80] *Chronicon Anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum*, Chabot, 138f. (Harrak, 132).

[81] Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, Chabot, 314–19 (252–61).

for a while, the Chalcedonians in power, the non-Chalcedonians condemned. Neither the Second Council of Constantinople nor Justinian's later moves had brought about any change of their situation. Therefore, 553 remained a date worth mentioning in passing, but the authors already saw their history separated from the fate of Justinian and the Chalcedonian church of the empire.[82]

Non-Chalcedonian authors instead remembered the non-Chalcedonian past for their non-Chalcedonian audience. What John of Beth Aphtonia as the author of the *Life of Severus*, the anonymous author of the *Life of John bar Aphtonia*, and Elias as author of the *Life of John of Tella* began at the end of the 530s and early 540s, Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor and especially John of Ephesus continued in the 560s. They reflected on their non-Chalcedonian past and present on which the Second Council of Constantinople left no imprint. Their passion went into the commemoration of the conflicts of their ecclesiastical fathers and their own struggles in the years following 518, and focused on the most memorable saints as well as on the most dreadful foes. They narrated the path leading to their current position of being the discriminated and persecuted apostolic Church: for John of Ephesus post-518 was the time when the later so-called Syrian Orthodox and especially their leaders revealed their saintly and heroic qualities against the Chalcedonian enemies who tried to destroy them and their heritage. The 540s to 560s mark the period when non-Chalcedonian hagiography and church history started to canonize the post-451 and post-518 past.

From the 560s onwards the Syrian Orthodox always picked up this line of understanding their fifth- and sixth-century past. Ps.-Dionysius in the eighth and Michael the Syrian in the twelfth century used John of Ephesus' writings extensively for their narrative of the sixth-century persecutions. Ps.-Dionysius took John as one of his main sources and mentioned him in the introduction to his work as did Michael the Syrian.[83] Michael the Syrian even referred the reader to

[82] A fact that did not prevent John of Ephesus from using the cases of Anthimus and Theodora to illustrate that non-Chalcedonianism had the potential to be the doctrine of the church of the empire. See Chapter 5.

[83] Witakowski, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē*, 132. Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* Preface; Chabot, 1. D. Weltecke, *Die «Beschreibung der Zeiten» von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199). Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographischen Kontext*, Leuven: Peeters 2003, 138.

John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints.*[84] Both authors knew also Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor's *Church History* but hardly used him for the crucial period 520–40. Whereas Ps.-Dionysius seems not to have used Ps.-Zachariah-Rhetor at all for this period, Michael the Syrian employed Ps.-Zachariah's work only to add more information which he could not find in John of Ephesus.[85] Ps-Zachariah Rhetor provides original documents such as letters and offers a mediating view concerning the Chalcedonians, but Ps.-Dionysius and also Michael preferred to adopt John of Ephesus' highly coloured image of the past.[86] John's saints became their saints, and John's image of the past became their tradition, remembered as the history of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

This is not only true for the medieval Syrian Orthodox chroniclers but also for the Syrian Orthodox liturgy which commemorated the past as well. The *Book of Life*, which is mentioned since the time of George, bishop of the Arab tribes (seventh–eighth centuries), was, like the diptychs, a list of persons commemorated in the church. It was read out in the Syrian Orthodox Church on feast days instead of the diptychs of the dead, but fell out of use in the Middle Ages.[87] According to the twentieth-century Syrian Orthodox patriarch Aphram I Barsoum it was read 'in some churches [...] once a year only to perpetuate the memory of the church fathers and dignitaries'.[88] All the persecuted non-Chalcedonians and their protectors from the post-518 period are remembered here, Philoxenus of Mabbug,

[84] Weltecke, *Die « Beschreibung der Zeiten » von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199)*, 150.

[85] For example the 'plerophoria' of the non-Chalcedonian bishops (Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* IX.22; Chabot, 281–4 (196–202)).

[86] However, as Haase already noted for the Third Part of John's *Church History*, John provided a very detailed and important account on which in one way or the other later Syrian Orthodox chronicles needed to rely; see F. Haase, 'Untersuchungen zur Chronik des Pseudo-Dionysios', *OrChr* 6 (1916), 65–90, 240–70, here 76, where he certainly goes too far speaking of the healthy, historical sense of truth of the later Syrian church historians.

[87] R. H. Connolly, 'The Book of Life', *JThS* 13 (1912), 580–94. According to Bar Salibi the reading of the *Book of Life* ceased in the twelfth century, but it was copied at least until the seventeenth century. Connolly and Codrington made their edition and translation from a manuscript dated to 1648; see below n. 89.

[88] Ignatius Aphram I Barsoum, *The Scattered Pearls: A History of Syriac Literature and Sciences*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2003, 98.

Severus of Antioch, Thomas of Germanicia, John of Tella, John bar Aphtonia, Jacob Baradaeus, and also 'Theodora the believing and orthodox queen'.[89]

The Syrian Orthodox Church regards John of Tella as 'one of the greatest militants for the orthodox faith', and he is 'considered a true confessor of the faith and was commemorated by the church'.[90] The empress Theodora is honoured in a 'historical play' for her 'faith and service to the church' and for her 'endeavor in spreading the Gospel'.[91] She is also commemorated in combination with Jacob Baradaeus as both allegedly had been born in the year 500. The Syrian Orthodox diocese of Mount Lebanon even published an icon for them together for their 1500th anniversary in 2000.[92]

In the understanding of the Syrian Orthodox the period between the accession of Justin I in 518 and the death of Jacob Baradaeus in 578 was a 'critical' time because of the persecutions, but it was not the founding period of their church. Through the work of Jacob Baradaeus and the empress Theodora the Syrian Orthodox Church had—according to their Patriarch Ignatius Zakka I Iwas—'withstood the heavy blows of Byzantine persecution and maintained the apostolic faith, affirmed by the three councils'.[93] The apostolic faith had only been retained until today because 'the Apostolic warrior Mor

[89] *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy by George Bishop of the Arab Tribes and Moses bar Kepha: Together with the Syriac Anaphora of St. James and a Document entitled* The Book of Life, ed. R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington, London: Williams & Norgate 1913, 123–5. Theodora is named next to Abgar, Constantine, Helena, Jovian, Theodosius I, Honorius, Arcadius, Theodosius II, Zeno, Anastasius, and 'the rest of the believing and victorious kings'.

[90] Aphram I Barsoum, *The Scattered Pearls*, 274f.

[91] Gregorius Boulos Behnam, a Syrian Orthodox bishop, originally wrote the play in Arabic, but it is now translated into English: *Theodora: A Story of Heroism, Strife, Sacrifice, and Faith treating the Affairs of the Syriac Church in the First Half of the Sixth Century*, trans. Matti Moosa, Piscataway: Gorgias Press and Beth Antioch Press 2007.

[92] Ignatius Zakka I. Iwas, Patriarch of the Holy See of Antioch, 'Lent Encyclical—February 12, 2000. Fifteen hundredth Anniversary of Birth of Mor Ya'qub Burd'ono and Queen Theodora', in *Syrian Orthodox Resources* (http://sor.cua.edu/Personage/PZakka1/20000212MYBurdconoTheodora.html), 1–7. I am grateful to Edip Aydin, now Metropolitan Mor Polycarpus, for the reference to the Encyclical and the information concerning the icon.

[93] Ignatius Zakka I. Iwas, Patriarch of the Holy See of Antioch, 'The Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch at a Glance', in *Syrian Orthodox Resources* (1983) (http://sor.cua.edu/Pub/PZakka1/SOCAtAGlance.html), 14.

Ya'qub Burd'ono [Jacob Baradaeus] [...] was able to expose the evil intentions of the tyrannical Byzantine state'.[94]

Such a perception of the reign of Justin and Justinian becomes possible only by adopting the historical framework of John of Ephesus, who had, according to Ignatius Zakka I Iwas, 'a close relationship with her [Theodora's] family' and whose *Lives of the Eastern Saints* assured the Syrian Orthodox in the Middle Ages but also today that their forefathers had defended the apostolic faith against the oppressors.[95] Since the 530/40s Jacob Baradaeus and Theodora preserved this faith for which the non-Chalcedonian bishops had suffered after 518, and which the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical fathers between 451 and 518 had attempted to make the faith of the imperial church. Thereby the Syrian Orthodox perceive in their commemoration of these times a continuity since the apostles without any breaks or bends.

This interpretation of the past stands diametrically opposed to the analysis of this period by a historian. Focusing on historical change, historians emphasize discontinuity and conceive severe breaks in 451, 518, and after 536/8. After the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the non-Chalcedonians remained opposed to Chalcedon and Chalcedonians by means of a different interpretation of the Church Fathers, especially Cyril. After 518 they split because they refused the papal understanding of the past, and underwent suffering through discrimination and persecutions that set them apart from the Chalcedonians. They started to realize the importance of their tradition and reshaped their past by emphasizing their adherence to the patriarchs Peter the Fuller, Peter Mongus, and Acacius, all of whom had been controversial before 518. After the death of a generation at the end of the 530s, the following generation of non-Chalcedonians reflected on the persecutions and their leaders who had suffered. Through hagiography and church history they canonized their understanding of this past.

[94] Ignatius Zakka I. Iwas, 'Lent Encyclical—February 12, 2000', 6.

[95] John actually wrote a short *Life* of Jacob Baradaeus and another short *Life* of Jacob and Theodore; see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* 49 and 50, in *PO* 18 and *PO* 19, 690–7 and 153–8; for the longer, but spurious *Life*, see John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* Appendix, in *PO* 19, 228–68.

Therefore, a different interpretation of texts after 451 turned after 518 into a split of historical experience. This historical experience shared by all schismatic bishops and resisting monks created the formation of a communal memory, and in their self-perception the non-Chalcedonians retained their apostolic faith, thereby differing significantly from those who subscribed to the *libellus*. The persecutions caused the non-Chalcedonian establishment of a separate institution that can be called church as it has its own priests, sacraments, and canons. Although persecuted, the non-Chalcedonians preserved their intellectual resources, such as the proceedings of the Second Council of Ephesus, and made texts by persecuted bishops like Severus available to the Syrian audience. Even in exile, the non-Chalcedonians could offer their laity a distinct non-Chalcedonian liturgy with the names of their bishops read out from the diptychs and could claim to administer at the end of the liturgy a different Eucharist, which would ensure the laity's salvation. The perception of especially the post-518 past, which differed from the Chalcedonians', found its written form in works like John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints*. His works represent the intellectual digestion of the sufferings of his fellow monks and believers.

As this commemoration of the past remains exclusive to the Syrian Orthodox Church, one might speak here of a founding myth. Myth in this sense is past remembered, not actual history.[96] The non-Chalcedonians withstood the papal and imperial threat to erase their tradition and established their own church against the imperial church in the realm of the empire. They defined themselves in opposition to the Chalcedonians, and the sense of a communal experienced past of persecution provides them with an identity as apostolic church. The separation found its reflection in texts shared only within this non-Chalcedonian church, which makes it a distinctive church with its own identity—the Syrian Orthodox Church.

[96] J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich: C. H. Beck 1992, 75f. 'Founding' refers here not to the beginning of the Syrian Orthodox tradition, but to a 'holding on' to the apostolic faith.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Constantine of Laodicea and Antoninus of Aleppo, *Letter to Thomas of Germanicia*, British Library Add. 14532, fols. 145a–145b

John of Tella, *Statement of Faith (Libellus fidei)*, British Library Add. 14549, fols. 219b–226b (see now also under editions)

John of Tella, *Regula ad Diaconos*, Cambridge University Library Add. 2023, fols. 250b–252b (see now also under editions)

Severus of Antioch, *Letter to Nonnus*, Harvard University Library Syr. 22, fols. 60a–60b

Thomas of Germanicia, *Letter to Presbyter John of Mar Eusebius*, British Library Add. 14532, fols. 142a–143a

Editions (with or without translation)

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, ed. Eduard Schwartz and Johannes Straub, Berlin and Leipzig: Karl Trübner and Walter de Gruyter 1914–71

Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449, ed. Johannes Flemming with German translation by Georg Hoffmann, AGWG.PH 15.1, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung 1917

Ambrose, *Sancti Ambrosi Opera*, vol. x, ed. Michaela Zelzer, CSEL 82, Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky 1982

Ammianus Marcellinus, vol. i, ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe, LCL 300, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1935

Anaphoras. The Book of the Divine Liturgies according to the Rite of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch, trans. Murad Saliba Barsom, ed. Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, Lodi: Mar A. Y. Samuel 1991

Saint Basil, *The Letters*, ed. and trans. Roy J. Deferrari, LCL 215, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1928

Chronica Minora, 3 Vols., ed. and trans. E. W. Brooks, I. Guidi, and J.-B. Chabot, CSCO 1–6, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1955

The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, composed in Syriac A.D. 507, ed. and trans. William Wright, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1882

The Chronicle of Marcellinus, ed. and trans. Brian Croke, Byzantina Australiensia 7, Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies 1995

Chronicon (Anonymum) ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens, ed. and trans. Jean-Baptiste Chabot, CSCO 81/109, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq 1920/1937

Chronicon Paschale, ed. Ludwig Dindorf, Bonn: Ed. Weber 1832

Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199), 4 Vols., ed. and trans. Jean-Baptiste Chabot, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1899–1901

Codex vaticanus gr. 1431. Eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos, ed. Eduard Schwartz, ABAW.PH 32, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1927

Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *De Cerimoniis*, in *PG* 112, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1864, 73–1446

Corpus Iuris Civilis, vol. ii: *Codex Iustinianus*, ed. Paul Krueger, Berlin: Weidmann 1906; vol. iii: *Novellae*, ed. Rudolf Schoell and Wilhelm Kroll, Berlin: Weidmann 1904

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, vol. i: *Nicaea to Lateran V*, ed. G. Alberigo *et al.*, trans. N. P. Tanner, London: Sheed & Ward 1990

Dissertatio de Syrorum Fide et Disciplina in Re Eucharistica, ed. and trans. Thomas J. Lamy, Leuven: Vanlinthout 1859

Documenta ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustrandas, ed. and trans. Jean-Baptiste Chabot, CSCO 17/103, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae and Leuven: E Typographeo Marcelli Istas 1907/1933

Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'église nestorienne, ed. and trans. François Nau, in *PO* 13, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1919, 192–6

The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius, ed. Joseph Bidez and Léon Parmentier, London: Methuen 1898 [reprint Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert 1964]

Elias, *Het Leven van Johannes van Tella door Elias*, ed. and trans. Hendrik G. Kleyn, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882

Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio, vol. ii, ed. Otto Guenther, CSEL 35.2, Prague and Vienna: F. Tempsky 1898

Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae, vol. i, ed. Andreas Thiel, Braunschweig: E. Peter 1867

Facundi Episcopi Eccleasiae Hermianensis Opera Omnia, ed. Johannes-Maria Clément and Rolandus Vander Plaetse, CChr.SL 90A, Turnhout: Brepols 1974

The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire, vol. ii: *Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, ed. Roger C. Blockley, Liverpool: Francis Cairns 1983

Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum, vol. i: *Libri Pontificalis pars prior*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH, Berlin: Weidmann 1898

Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta, 4 Vols., ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, CSCO 83/84/87/88, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1919–24

Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert), ed. and trans. Addai Scher, Part II, in *PO* 7, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1911, 93–203

Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum Vulgo Dictum, ed. Jean-Baptiste Chabot, CSCO 104, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1933

Iohannis Caesariensis, Opera quae supersunt, ed. Marcellus Richard, CCG 1, Turnhout: Brepols 1977

Ioannis Malalae Chronographia, ed. Johannes Thurn, Berlin and New York: de Gruyter 2000

Jacob of Sarug, 'Lettres de Jacques de Saroug aux moines du Couvent de Mar Bassus, et à Paul d'Edesse', ed. and trans. P. Martin, *ZDMG* 30 (1876), 217–75

—— *Homiliae Selectae Mar Jacobi Sarugensis*, vol. i, ed. Paul Bedjan, Paris and Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1905

—— *Epistulae quotquot supersunt*, ed. Gunnar Olinder, CSCO 110, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1965

John bar Aphtonia, 'Histoire de Jean bar Aphtonia', ed. and trans. François Nau, *ROC* 7 (1902), 97–135

John of Beth Aphtonia, *Vie de Sévère par Jean Supérieur du Monastère de Beith-Aphtonia*, M.-A. Kugener, in *PO* 2, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 203–64

John of Ephesus, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*, ed. William Cureton, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1853

—— *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, in *PO* 17–19, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1923–5

—— *Iohannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, CSCO 105, 106, Paris 1935–6 [reprint: Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq 1952]

John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, ed. Migne, in *PG* 87.3, 2852–3112

John Rufus, *Plérophories*, ed. and trans. François Nau, in *PO* 8, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1912, 1–208

—— *Petrus der Iberer. Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des Fünften Jahrhunderts*, ed. and trans. Richard Raabe, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1895

John of Tella, 'Il commento al Trisagio di Giovanni Bar Qūrsūs', ed. and trans. Vincenzo Poggi and Mar Grigorios (Hanna Ibrahim), *OCP* 52 (1986), 202–10

John of Tella, 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*: John of Tella, his Eucharistic Ecclesiology and the Establishment of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in Exile', ed. and trans. Volker Menze, *OrChr* 90 (2006), 44–90

—— *John of Tella's* Statement of Faith, ed. and trans. Kutlu Akalin and Volker Menze, TeCLA, Piscataway: Gorgias Press (forthcoming)

Justinian, *Drei dogmatische Schriften*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, ABAW.PH n.f. 18, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1939

Kyrillos von Skythopolis, ed. Eduard Schwartz, TU 49.2, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1939

Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites*: Testimonies of the Saints *and* Aporiae, ed. and trans. Patrick T. R. Gray, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006

Liberatus, *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, in *ACO* II.5, Berlin: de Gruyter 1936, 98–141

Liturgies Eastern and Western, vol. i: *Eastern Liturgies*, ed. and trans. F. E. Brightman, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1896

Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century, ed. and trans. Albert van Roey and Pauline Allen, Leuven: Peeters/Departement Orientalistiek 1994

Nestorius, *Le Livre d'Héraclide de Damas*, ed. Paul Bedjan, Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1910

A Panegyric on Macarius, Bishop of Tkôw attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria, ed. and trans. D. W. Johnson, CSCO 415, 416, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1980

Philoxenus, *Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbug (485–519)*, ed. and trans. Arthur A. Vaschalde, Rome: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei 1902

—— *Lettre aux moins de Senoun*, ed. and trans. André de Halleux, CSCO 231/2, Leuven: Peeters 1963

—— 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', ed. and trans. Joseph Lebon, *Le Muséon* 43 (1930), 17–84, 149–220

Photius, *Bibliothèque*, vol. iv, ed. and trans. René Henry, Paris: Les belles Lettres 1965

Procopius, *The Anecdota*, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 290, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1935

—— *Buildings*, ed. and trans. H. B. Dewing, LCL 343, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1940

Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma, ed. Eduard Schwartz, ABAW.PH n.f. 10, Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1934

Les Saints Stylites, ed. Hippolyte Delehaye, Brussels: Société des Bollandistes 1923

Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio, vols. v, vii, ix, ed. Joannes Dominicus Mansi, Florence: Expenses Antonii Zatta 1763 [Reprint Berlin/Paris 1902]

Severus of Antioch, 'Allocution prononcée par Sévère après son élévation sur le trône d'Antioche', ed. M.-A. Kugener, *OrChr* 2 (1902), 265–82

—— *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, 2 vols., London: Williams and Norgate 1902–4

—— *Collection of Letters*, 2 Vols., ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, in *PO* 12 and 14, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1915/20

—— *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 52–57*, ed. R. Duval, in *PO* 4, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1908, 1–94

—— *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 57–69*, ed. M. Brière, in *PO* 8, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1912, 209–396

—— *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 120–125*, ed. M. Brière, in *PO* 29, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1960, 1–262

—— *Les Homiliae Cathedrales 32–39*, ed. F. Graffin, in *PO* 36, Turnhout: Brepols 1972, 393–533

—— *Contra impium Grammaticum*, ed. Joseph Lebon, CSCO 93/4, 101/2, 111/12, Leuven: Peeters 1952

—— 'Fragments Coptes d'une Lettre de Sévère d'Antioche à Sotérichos de Césarée', ed. and trans. G. Garitte, *Muséon* 65 (1952), 185–98

Studia Syriaca, ed. Ignatius Rahmani, 4 Vols., Sharfi: Typis Patriarchalibus in Seminario Scharfensi 1904–9

The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition, ed. and trans. Arthur Vööbus, 4 Vols., CSCO 367, 368, 375, 376, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1975–6

Syriac and Arabic Documents regarding Legislation relative to Syrian Asceticism, ed. and trans. Arthur Vööbus, Stockholm 1960

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Histoire des Moines de Syrie*, ed. with French translation P. Canivet and A. Leroy-Molinghen, vol. ii, SC 257, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf 1979

Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, Berlin: Akademie 1971

Theophanis Chronographia, ed. Karl de Boor, Leizpig: Teubner 1883

Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy by George Bishop of the Arab Tribes and Moses bar Kepha: Together with the Syriac Anaphora of St. James and a Document entitled The Book of Life, ed. R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington, London: Williams & Norgate 1913

Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, CSCO 7–8, Paris: E Typographeo Reipublicae 1907

Vittore da Tunnuna, *Chronica. Chiesa e Impero nell' età di Giustiniano*, ed. Antonio Plancanica, Florence: Sismel Edizioni del Galluzzi 1997

Zachariah Rhetor, *Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scholastique*, ed. and trans. M.-A. Kugener, in *PO* 2, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1907, 3–115

Translations

The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, 3 Vols., trans. with introduction and notes by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, TTH 45, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2005

The Biography of John of Tella (d. A.D. 537) by Elias, trans. Joseph R. Ghanem, Ph.D. Thesis, Madison, Wis. 1970

The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis). *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, trans. Raymond Davis, TTH 6, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000

The Chronicle of John Malalas, trans. E. and M. Jeffreys, and R. Scott, Melbourne: Australian Association of Byzantine Studies 1986

The Chronicle of John (c. 690 A.D.) Coptic Bishop of Nikiu, trans. R. H. Charles, Text and Translation Society 3, London 1916

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, trans. Frank R. Trombley and John W. Watt, TTU 32, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000

The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813, trans. and commented by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1997

The Chronicle of Zuqnin Pars III and IV A.D. 488–775, trans. Amir Harrak, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies 1999

Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD, trans. Michael and Mary Whitby, TTU 7, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1989

St. Cyril of Alexandria Letters 51–110, trans. John I. McEnerney, Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press 1987

Cyril of Scythopolis, *Lives of the Monks of Palestine*, trans. Richard M. Price, CS 114, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1991

The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus, trans. Michael Whitby, TTH 33, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2000

Jacob of Sarug, 'A Homily of Mâr Jacob of Sérûgh on the Memorial of the Departed and on the Eucharistic Loaf', trans. H. Connolly, *DR* 29 (1910), 260–70

—— *Les Lettres de Jacques de Saroug*, trans. Micheline Albert, Patrimoine Syriaque 3, Kaslik: Université Saint Esprit de Kaslik 2004

John of Ephesus, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus*, trans. Robert Payne Smith, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1860

—— *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, trans. Josef M. Schönfelder, Munich: Henter'sche Buchhandlung 1862

John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow*, trans. John Wortley, CS 139, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1992

Nau, François, 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', *ROC* 14 (1909), 1–49 and 113–30

Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. Godfrey R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1925

On the Person of Christ. The Christology of Emperor Justinian, trans. and intro. Kenneth P. Wesche, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1991

Philoxenus, 'La lettre de Philoxène de Mabboug à Abou-Niphir', trans. François Nau, *ROC* 8 (1903), 623–33

Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, *Chronicle Part III*, trans. Witold Witakowski, TTU 22, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 1996

Roman State and Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535, trans. Paul R. Coleman-Norton, vols. ii and iii, London: SPCK 1966

Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, trans. Archibald Robertson, NPNF 4, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1953

Socrates and Sozomenus, *Church Histories*, trans. Andrew C. Zenos and Chester D. Hartranft, NPNF 2, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1952

Das Synaxarium. Das Koptische Heiligenbuch mit den Heiligen zu jedem Tag des Jahres, trans. Robert and Lilly Suter, Waldsoms-Kröffelbach: St. Antonius Kloster 1994

Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *A History of the Monks of Syria*, trans. Richard M. Price, CS 88, Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Press 1985

Three Byzantine Saints. Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. Theodore of Sykeon and St. John the Almsgiver, trans. Elizabeth Dawes and Norman H. Baynes, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1996

Zachariah of Mitylene, *The Syriac Chronicle*, trans. Frederick J. Hamilton and Ernest W. Brooks, London: Methuen 1899

Secondary Literature

Abramowski, Luise, 'Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien', *ZKG* 67 (1955/6), 252–87

—— *Untersuchungen zum* Liber Heraclidis *des Nestorius*, CSCO 242, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1963

Abramowski, Luise, 'La Prétendue condamnation de Diodore de Tarse en 499', *RHE* 60 (1965), 64–5

Adontz, Nicholas, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian: The Political Conditions based on the* Naxarar *System*, trans. Nina Garsoïan, Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation 1970

Alivisatos, Hamilcar S., *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I.*, Berlin: Trowitzsch & Son 1913 [Aalen: Scientia 1973]

Allen, Pauline, 'Zachariah Scholasticus and the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus', *JThS* n.s. 31.2 (1980), 471–88

—— *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 1981

—— 'Severus of Antioch and the Homily: The End of the Beginning?' in Pauline Allen and Elizabeth Jeffreys, *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, Brisbane: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies 1996, 163–75

—— 'A Bishop's Spirituality: The Case of Severus of Antioch', in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, vol. i, ed. P. Allen, R. Canning, and L. Cross, Everton Park: Centre for Early Christian Studies 1998, 169–80

—— 'Severus of Antioch and Pastoral Care', in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, vol. ii, ed. P. Allen, W. Mayer, and L. Cross, Everton Park: Centre for Early Christian Studies 1999, 387–400

—— 'Severus of Antioch as Pastoral Carer', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 353–68

—— 'The Syrian Church through Bishops' Eyes: The Letters of Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Severus of Antioch', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 3–21

Allen, Pauline, and Hayward, C. T. R., *Severus of Antioch*, London and New York: Routledge 2004

Allen, Pauline, and Meyer, Wendy, 'Through a Bishop's Eyes: Towards a Definition of Pastoral Care in Late Antiquity', *Aug.* 40 (2000), 345–97

Altaner, Berthold, 'Zum Schrifttum der "skythischen" (gotischen) Mönche', *HJ* 72 (1953), 568–81

Anastos, Milton V., 'The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia', *DOP* 6 (1951), 125–60

—— '*Vox Populi Voluntas Dei* and the Election of the Byzantine Emperor', in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Part 2: *Early Christianity*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12, Leiden: Brill 1975, 181–207

—— 'The Emperor Justin I's Role in the Restoration of Chalcedonian Doctrine, 518–519', in *Δώρημα στον Ι. Καραγιαννόπουλο* (=*Βυζαντινά* 13), Thessalonike 1985, 125–39

Assemani, Joseph S., *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Codicum Manuscriptorum Catalogus in Tres Partes Distributus*, vols. i/2 and 3, Rome: Ex Typographia Linguarum Orientalium 1758–9

Assmann, Jan, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich: C. H. Beck 1992

—— *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Zehn Studien*, Munich: C. H. Beck 2000

Ayres, Lewis, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004

Bacht, Heinrich, 'Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431–519)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 193–314

Bardill, Jonathan, 'The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople and the Monophysite Refugees', *DOP* 54 (2002), 1–11

Bark, William C., 'John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina', *HTR* 36 (1943), 93–107

Barker, John W., *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*, Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press 1966

Barkhuizen, J. H., 'Justinian's Hymn', *BZ* 77 (1984), 3–5

Barnes, Timothy, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1993

Bauer, Walter, 'Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor', in Walter Bauer, *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1967, 210–28

Baumstark, Anton, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn: A. Marcus and E. Webers 1922

Beck, Hans-Georg, *Kaiserin Theodora und Prokop. Der Historiker und sein Opfer*, Munich: Piper 1986

Behnam, Gregorius Boulos, *Theodora: A Story of Heroism, Strife, Sacrifice, and Faith treating the Affairs of the Syriac Church in the First Half of the Sixth Century*, trans. Matti Moosa, Piscataway: Gorgias Press and Beth Antioch Press 2007

Bishop, Edmund, 'An Appendix', in R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Text and Studies 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1909, 85–163

Bou Mansour, Tanios, *La Théologie de Jacques de Saroug*, 2 Vols., Kaslik: Bibliothèque de l'Université Saint-Esprit 1993–2000

Bowes, Kim, 'Ivory Lists: Consular Diptychs, Christian Appropriation and Polemics of Time in Late Antiquity', *Art History* 24.3 (2001), 338–57

—— 'Personal Devotions and Private Chapels', in *Late Antique Christianity*, ed. Virginia Burrus, Minneapolis: Fortress Press 2005, 188–210

Brakke, David, *Athanasius and Asceticism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1995

Brakmann, Heinzgerd, 'Severus unter den Alexandrinern. Zum liturgischen Diptychon in Boston', *JbAC* 26 (1983), 54–8

Braun, Joseph, *Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, vol. i, Munich: Alte Meister Guenther Koch & Co 1924

Brennecke, Hanns Christof, *Studien zur Geschichte der Homöer. Der Osten bis zum Ende der homöischen Reichskirche*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1988

Brock, Sebastian, 'Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severus', *StPatr* 12 (1975), 17–24

—— 'Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac', in *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*, ed. A. Dietrich, AAWG.PH 96, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1975, 80–108

—— 'Iconoclasm and the Monophysites', in *Iconoclasm*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin, Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies 1977, 53–7

—— 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47 (1981), 87–121

—— 'Tenth-Century Diptychs of the Coptic Orthodox Church in a Syriac Manuscript', *BSAC* 26 (1984), 23–9

—— 'The Thrice-Holy Hymn in the Liturgy', *Sobornost* 7 (1985), 24–34

—— 'The "Nestorian" Church: A Lamentable Misnomer', in *The Church of the East: Life and Thought*, ed. J. F. Coakley and K. Parry, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78.3 (1996), 23–35 [reprinted in: Sebastian Brock, *Fire from Heaven: Studies in Syriac Theology and Liturgy*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2006]

Brooks, Ernest W., 'The Dates of the Alexandrine Patriarchs Dioskoros II, Timothy IV and Theodosius', *BZ* 12 (1903), 493–7

Brown, Peter, 'Eastern and Western Christendom in Late Antiquity: A Parting of the Ways', in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, ed. D. Baker, Studies in Church History 13, Oxford: Blackwell 1976, 1–24

—— *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England 2001

Bruns, Peter, 'Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Die Haltung des Facundus von Hermiane und der nordafrikanische Kirche während des Drei-Kapitel-Streits (553)', *ZKG* 106 (1995), 151–78

—— 'Johannes bar Aphtonia', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. Siegmar Döpp and Wilhelm Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 375

—— 'Kirchengeschichte als Hagiographie? Zur theologischen Konzeption des Johannes von Ephesus', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 65–71

Bühring, Gernot and Uhlig, Siegbert, 'Antiochenisches und Justinianisches im Hymnus "Eingeborener Sohn"', *OstKSt* 37 (1988), 297–307

Bundy, David D., 'Jacob Baradaeus: The State of Research, a Review of Sources and a New Approach', *Muséon* 91 (1978), 45–86

Bury, J. B., 'The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos', *EHR* 22 (1907), 209–27 and 417–39

Cameron, Alan, 'The House of Anastasius', *GBRS* 19 (1978), 259–76

Cameron, Averil, 'The Early Religious Policies of Justin II', in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, Studies in Church History 13, ed. D. Barker, Oxford: Blackwell 1976, 51–67

—— *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London: Duckworth 1985

—— 'Models of the Past in the Late Sixth Century: The Life of the Patriarch Eutychius', in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Clarke, Canberra: Australian National University Press 1990, 205–23

—— 'Disputations, Polemical Literature and the Formation of Opinion in the Early Byzantine Period', in *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East*, ed. G. J. Reinink and H. L. J. Vanstiphout, OLA 42, Leuven: Peeters 1991, 91–108

Caquot, André, 'Couvents antiques', in Georges Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord. Le massif du Bélus à l'époque romaine*, vol. iii, Paris: Paul Geuthner 1958, 63–85

Caseau, Béatrice, 'L'Abandon de la Communion dans la Main (IVe–XIIe S.)', in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, Travaux et Mémoires 14, Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance 2002, 79–94

Caspar, Erich, *Geschichte des Papsttums. Von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, 2 Vols., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1933

Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, 'Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques de la Bibliothèque Nationale acquis depuis 1874 (Nos 289–334)', *JA*, IX série, 8 (1896), 1–19

Charanis, Peter, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*, Byzantina Keimena Kai Meletai 11, Thessalonica: Kentron Byzantinon Ereunon 1974

Chesnut, Roberta C., *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Sarug*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1976

Chrysos, Evangelos, 'Zur Datierung und Tendenz der Werke des Facundus von Hermiane', *ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑ* 1 (1969), 311–23

—— 'Konzilspräsident und Konzilsvorstand. Zur Frage des Vorsitzes in den Konzilien der byzantinischen Reichskirche', *AHC* 11 (1979), 1–17

Clark, Elizabeth, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1992

Clauss, Manfred, 'Die *συμφωνία* von Staat und Kirche zur Zeit Justinians', in *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. K. Dietz, D. Henning, and H. Kaletsch, Würzburg: Selbstverlag 1993, 579–93

Coakley, J. F., 'A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library', *BJRL* 75.2 (1993), 105–99

Codrington, H. W., 'The Syrian Liturgy', *ECQ* 1 (1936), 10–20, 40–9, 87–99, 135–48

Connolly, R. H., 'The Book of Life', *JThS* 13 (1912), 580–94

Coon, Lynda L., *Sacred Fictions: Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1997

Cowe, S. Peter, 'Daniel of Salah as Commentator on the Psalter', *StPatr* 20 (1989), 152–9

Croke, Brian, Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration', *Byz.* 51 (1981), 122–47

—— *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001

Crum, W. E., 'A Greek Diptych of the Seventh Century', *PSBA* 30 (1908), 255–65

—— 'Sévère d'Antioche en Égypte', *ROC* 23 (1922/3), 92–104

Dagron, Gilbert, 'Two Documents concerning Mid-Sixth-Century Mopsuestia', in *Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis*, ed. A. E. Laiou-Thomadakis, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press 1980, 19–30

—— *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le «césaropapisme» byzantin*, Paris: Éditions Gallimard 1996

Daube, David, 'The Marriage of Justinian and Theodora: Legal and Theological Reflections', *CULR* 16 (1968), 380–99

Déroche, Vincent, 'Représentations de l'eucharistie dans la haute époque Byzantine', in *Mélanges Gilbert Dagron*, Travaux et Mémoires 14, Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance 2002, 167–80

Devreesse, Robert, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête Arabe*, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre 1945

Diehl, Charles, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VIe siècle*, Paris: Ernest Leroux 1901

—— *Theodora, Empress of Byzantium*, trans. Samuel R. Rosenbaum, New York: Frederick Ungar 1972

Diekamp, Franz, 'Das Zeitalter des Erzbischofs Andreas von Cäsarea', *HJ* 18 (1897), 1–36

—— *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil*, Münster i.W.: Aschendorff 1899

—— *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1938

Dietrich, G., *Eine jakobitische Einleitung in den Psalter*, Giessen: J. Ricker 1901

Dillemann, Louis, *Haute Mésopotamie Orientale et Pays Adjacents*, Paris: Libraire Orientaliste Paul Geuthner 1962

Dinkler-v. Schubert, Erika, 'Nomen ipsum crucis absit (Cicero, Pro Rabirio 5,16). Zur Abschaffung der Kreuzigungsstrafe in der Spätantike', *JbAC* 35 (1992), 135–46 with plate 5

Dölger, Franz Joseph, 'Heidnische und christliche Brotstempel mit religiösen Zeichen', *AuC* 1 (1929), 1–46 with plates 1–10

—— 'Die Heiligkeit des Altars und ihre Begründung im christlichen Altertum', *AuC* 2 (1930), 161–83

Downey, Glanville, 'Ephraemius, Patriarch of Antioch', *ChH* 7 (1938), 365–70

—— *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1961

Draguet, René, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa Controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'Incorruptibilité du Corps du Christ*, Leuven: P. Smeesters 1924

—— 'Une Pastorale Antijulianiste des environs de l'Année 530', *Muséon* 40 (1927), 75–92

Duchesne, Louis, *L'Église au VIème siècle*, Paris: E. de Boccard, Successeur 1925

Dvornik, Francis, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1958

—— *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, vol. ii, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies 1966

Elert, Werner, 'Die theopaschitische Formel', *ThLZ* 75 (1950), 196–206

Engelhardt, Isrun, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Strukturanalyse byzantinischer Mission zur Zeit Justins und Justinians*, Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie 1974

Eno, Robert, 'Doctrinal Authority in the African Ecclesiology of the Sixth Century: Ferrandus and Facundus', *REAug* 22 (1976), 95–113

Ensslin, Wilhelm, 'Papst Agapet I. und Kaiser Justinian I.', *HJ* 77 (1958), 459–66

Esbroeck, Michael van, 'The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch', *JThS* n.s. 47 (1996), 464–76

Escolan, Philippe, *Monachisme et église. Le monachisme syrien du IVe au VIIe siècle: un ministère charismatique*, Théologie historique 109, Paris: Beauchesne 1999

Evans, James A. S., *The Age of Justinian: The Circumstances of Imperial Power*, London and New York: Routledge 1996

—— 'The Monophysite Persecution: The Eastern View', *The Ancient World* 27 (1996), 191–6

Evans, James A. S., *The Empress Theodora: Partner of Justinian*, Austin: University of Texas Press 2002

Feige, Gerhard, 'Apollinaris of Laodizea', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. Siegmar Döpp and Wilhelm Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 48–50

Fischer-Pap, Lucia, *Eva: Theodora. Evita Peron: Empress Theodora Reincarnated*, Rockford, Ill.: LFP 1982

Flusin, Bernard, 'L'hagiographie palestinienne et la réception du concile de Chalcédoine', in *ΑΕΙΜΩΝ. Studies presented to Lennart Rydén on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. O. Rosenqvist, SbyU 6, Uppsala 1996, 25–47

Fortescue, Adrian, *The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas*, Garrison, NY: National Office, Chair of Unity Octave 1955

Foss, Clive, 'Theodora and Evita: Two Women in Power', in *Novum Millenium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. C. Sode and S. Takács, Aldershot: Ashgate 2001, 113–21

—— 'The Empress Theodora', *Byz.* 72 (2002), 141–76

Fowden, Garth, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993

Frank, G. L. C., 'The Council of Constantinople II as a Model Reconciliation Council', *TS* 52 (1991), 636–50

Frend, William H. C., *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972

—— 'Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy', in *The Heritage of the Early Church*, ed. D. Neiman and M. Schatkin, OCA 195, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1973, 261–75

—— 'The Monophysites and the Transition between the Ancient World and the Middle Ages', in *Passagio dal Mondo Antico al Medio Evo da Teodosio a San Gregorio Magno*, Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1980, 339–65

Gaddis, Michael, 'Nestorius', in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1999, 603f.

—— *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2005

Garland, Lynda, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium AD 527–1204*, London and New York: Routledge 1999

George, James, 'Severus of Antioch's Response to Heresy and Religious Promiscuity', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 133–7

Gero, Stephen, 'Montanus and Montanism according to a Medieval Syriac Source', *JThS* n.s. 28 (1977), 520–4

Gerostergios, Asterios, *Justinian the Great: The Emperor and Saint*, Belmont, Mass.: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 1982

Gibbon, Edward, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. v, ed. J. B. Bury, London: Methuen 1898

Gillett, Andrew, *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2003

Ginkel, Jan J. van, 'John of Ephesus on Emperors: The Perception of the Byzantine Empire by a Monophysite', in *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992*, OCA 247, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1994, 323–33

—— 'John of Ephesus: A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium', Diss. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 1995

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., *Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue*, Missoula, Mo.: Scholars Press 1979

Graffin, François, 'Jean bar Aphtonya', in *DSp* 8 (1974), 284f.

Granič, B., 'Die Gründung des autokephalen Erzbistums von Justiniana Prima durch Justinian I im Jahre 535 n.Chr.', *Byz.* 2 (1925), 123–40

Gray, Patrick T. R., *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451–553)*, Leiden: Brill 1979

—— 'An Anonymous Severian Monophysite of the Mid-Sixth Century', *PBR* 1 (1982), 117–26

—— 'Neo-Chalcedonianism and the Tradition: From Patristic to Byzantine Theology', *ByzF* 8 (1982), 61–70

—— 'Forgery as an Instrument of Progress: Reconstructing the Theological Tradition in the Sixth Century', *BZ* 81 (1988), 284–9

—— ' "The Select Fathers": Canonizing the Patristic Past', *StPatr* 23 (1989), 21–36

—— 'Neuchalkedonismus', in *TRE* 24 (1994), 289–96

—— 'Through the Tunnel with Leontius of Jerusalem: The Sixth-Century Transformation of Theology', in Pauline Allen and Elizabeth Jeffreys (eds.), *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning?*, Brisbane: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies 1996, 187–96

Greatrex, Geoffrey, 'Flavius Hypatius, *Quem vidit validium Parthus sensitque timendum.* An Investigation of his Career', *Byz* 66 (1996), 120–42

—— 'The Nika Revolt: A Reappraisal', *JHS* 117 (1997), 60–86

—— 'Justin I and the Arians', *PatrSt* 34 (2001), 72–81

—— 'Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene: The Context and Nature of his Work', *JCSSS* 6 (2006), 39–52

—— 'The Early Years of Justin I's Reign in the Sources', *Electrum* 12 (2007), 99–113

Grillmeier, Alois, 'Vorbereitung des Mittelalters. Eine Studie über das Verhältnis von Chalkedonismus und Neu-Chalkedonismus in der latei-

nischen Theologie von Boethius bis zu Gregor dem Großen,' in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 791–839

Grillmeier, Alois, 'Der Neu-Chalkedonismus. Um die Berechtigung eines neuen Kapitels in der Dogmengeschichte', *HJ* 77 (1958), 151–66

—— *Mit ihm und in ihm. Christologische Forschungen und Perspektiven*, Freiburg: Herder 1975

—— *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, 4 Vols., Freiburg: Herder 1986–2002

Grillmeier, Alois and Bacht, Heinrich, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3 Vols., Würzburg: Echter 1951–4

Grumel, Venance, 'La papauté à Byzance. Saint Agapet (535–536)', *EstFr* 39 (1927), 11–27

Günther, Otto, 'Beiträge zur Chronologie der Briefe des Papstes Hormisda', in *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 162.XI, Vienna: F. Tempsky 1892

Haacke, Rhaban, 'Die kaiserliche Politik in den Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (451–553)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 95–177

Haacke, Walter, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma*, Rome: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae 1939

Haarer, Fiona K., *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, ARCA 46, Cambridge: Francis Cairns 2006

Haas, Christopher, 'Patriarch and People: Peter Mongus of Alexandria and Episcopal Leadership in the Late Fifth Century', *JECS* 1 (1993), 297–316

Haase, Felix, 'Untersuchungen zur Chronik des Pseudo-Dionysios', *OrChr* 6 (1916), 65–90, 240–70

—— 'Die Abfassungszeit der Edessenischen Chronik', *OrChr* 7/8 (1918), 88–96

Haller, Johannes, *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, vol. i, Urbach and Stuttgart: Port 1950

Halleux, André de, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Leuven: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1963

Hanson, Richard P. C., *The Search for the Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1988

Hanssens, Johannes Michael, *Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus*, vol. iii, Rome: Apud Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregorianae 1932

Hardy, Edward R., 'The Egyptian Policy of Justinian', *DOP* 22 (1968), 21–41

Harnack, Adolf, *History of Dogma*, vol. iv, New York: Russell & Russell 1958

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook, 'Asceticism in Adversity: An Early Byzantine Experience', *BMGS* 6 (1980), 1–11

—— 'The Politicisation of the Byzantine Saint', in *The Byzantine Saint: University of Birmingham Fourteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, ed. Sergei Hackel, Studies Supplementary to Sobornost 5, London: Fellowhip of St Alban and St Sergius 1981, 37–42

—— 'Remembering Pain: Syriac Historiography and the Separation of the Churches', *Byz.* 58 (1988), 295–308

—— *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and* The Lives of the Eastern Saints, Berkeley: University of California Press 1990

—— 'Johannes von Ephesus', in *RAC* 18 (1997), 553–64

—— 'Theodora the "Believing Queen": A Study in Syriac Historiographical Tradition', *Hugoye* 4.2 (2001) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol4No2/HV4N2Harvey.html], pars. 1–31

Hatch, William Henry Paine, *An Album of dated Syriac Manuscripts*, Boston, Mass.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences 1946

Hay, Kathleen M., 'Evolution of Resistance: Peter the Iberian, Itinerant Bishop', in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, vol. i, ed. P. Allen, R. Canning, and L. Cross, Everton Park: Centre for Early Christian Studies 1998, 159–68

—— 'Severus of Antioch: An Inheritor of Palestinian Monasticism', *Aram* 15 (2003), 159–71

von Hefele, Carl Joseph, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii, Freiburg: Herder, 2nd edn. 1875

Helmer, Siegfried, 'Der Neuchalkedonismus. Geschichte, Berechtigung und Bedeutung eines dogmengeschichtlichen Begriffes', Diss. Bonn 1962

Hevelone-Harper, Jennifer L., *Disciples of the Desert: Monks, Laity, and Spiritual Authority in Sixth Century Gaza*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press 2005

Hindo, Paul, *Disciplina Antiochena Antica Siri*, vol. ii, Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana 1951

Hofmann, Fritz, 'Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon von Leo dem Großen bis Hormisdas (451–519)', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 13–94

Hofmann, Johannes, 'Der hl. Papst Agapit I. und die Kirche von Byzanz', *OstKSt* 40 (1991), 113–132

Holder-Egger, Oswald, 'Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 1 (1876), 213–368

Honigmann, Ernst, 'Nordsyrische Klöster in vorarabischer Zeit', *ZS* 1 (1922), 15–33

—— 'Studien zur Notitia Antiochena', *BZ* 25 (1925), 60–88

Honigmann, Ernst, *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071 nach griechischen, arabischen, syrischen und armenischen Quellen*, Brussels: Éditions de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales 1935

—— 'The Original Lists of the Members of the Council of Nicaea, the Robber-Synod and the Council of Chalcedon', *Byz.* 16 (1942/3), 20–80

—— 'The Patriarchate of Antioch: A Revision of Le Quien and the *Notitia Antiochena*', *Traditio* 5 (1947), 135–61

—— 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5 (1950), 208–79

—— *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Leuven: L. Durbecq 1951

—— *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173, Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1953

Hopkins, Keith, 'Christian Number and its Implications', *JECS* 6 (1998), 185–226

Horn, Cornelia, 'Peter the Iberian and Palestinian Anti-Chalcedonian Monasticism in Fifth- and Early Sixth-Century Gaza', *Aram* 15 (2003), 109–28

—— *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine: The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006

Humfress, Caroline, 'Roman Law, Forensic Argument and the Formation of Christian Orthodoxy (III–VI Centuries)', in *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire. Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, ed. S. Elm and É. Rebillard, Rome: École Française 2000, 125–47

Ignatius Aphram I Barsoum, *The Scattered Pearls: A History of Syriac Literature and Sciences*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2003 [translation of study in Arabic from 1943]

Ignatius Zakka I. Iwas, Patriarch of the Holy See of Antioch, 'The Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch at a Glance', in *Syrian Orthodox Resources* (1983) (http://sor.cua.edu/Pub/PZakka1/SOCAtAGlance.html), 1–26

—— 'Lent Encyclical—February 12, 2000. Fifteen Hundredth Anniversary of Birth of Mor Ya'qub Burd'ono and Queen Theodora', in *Syrian Orthodox Resources* (http://sor.cua.edu/Personage/PZakka1/20000212MYBurdconoTheodora.html), 1–7

Imboden, Roberta, *The Church, A Demon Lover: A Sartrean Analysis of an Institution*, Calgary: University of Calgary Press 1995

Janeras, Vicenç-S., 'Les Byzantins et le Trisagion Christologique', in *Miscellanea Liturgica*, vol. ii, Rome: Desclée & C.i Editori Pontifici 1967, 469–99

Jansma, T., 'The Credo of Jacob of Serugh: A Return to Nicaea and Constantinople', *NAKG* 44 (1961), 18–36

—— 'Encore le credo de Jacques de Saroug. Nouvelles recherches sur l'argument historique concernant son orthodoxie', *OrSyr* 10 (1965), 75–88, 193–236, 331–70, 475–510

—— 'Die Christologie Jakobs von Serugh und ihre Abhängigkeit von der alexandrinischen Theologie und der Frömmigkeit Ephraems des Syrers', *Muséon* 78 (1965), 5–46

Johnson, Dale A., *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the Library of the Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem*, Cascade Christian College 1987

Jones, A. H. M., 'Were Ancient Heresies National or Social Movements in Disguise?' *JThS* n.s. 10 (1959), 280–98

—— *The Later Roman Empire 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols., Oxford: B. Blackwell 1964

Kaldellis, Anthony, *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, History, and Philosophy at the End of Antiquity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2004

Kalla, Gábor, 'Das ältere Mosaik des byzantinischen Klosters in Tall Bi'a', *MDOG* 123 (1991), 35–9

Kannengiesser, C. and Stein, M. 'Iulianos VI', in *RAC* 19 (2001), 505–8

Key Fowden, Elizabeth, *The Barbarian Plain: Saint Sergius between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1999

Kirsch, J. P. and Klauser, Th., 'Altar III (christlich)', in *RAC* 1 (1950), 334–54

Kleyn, Hendrik G., *Jacob Baradaeus. De Stichter der syrische monophysietische Kerk*, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1882

Klum-Böhmer, Edith, *Das Trishagion als Versöhnungsformel der Christenheit*, Munich: Oldenbourg 1979

Kofsky, A., 'Peter the Iberian: Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine', *LA* 47 (1997), 209–20

Krausmüller, Dirk, 'Leontius of Jerusalem, a Theologian of the Seventh Century', *JThS* 52 (2001), 637–57

Krautheimer, Richard, 'Again Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople', *JÖB* 23 (1974), 251–3

Krebernik, Manfred, 'Schriftfunde aus Tall Bi'a 1990', *MDOG* 123 (1991), 41–70

Krüger, Paul, 'War Jakob von Serugh Katholik oder Monophysit?', *OstKSt* 2 (1953), 199–208

—— 'Das Problem der Rechtgläubigkeit Jakobs von Serugh und seine Lösung', *OstKSt* 5 (1956), 158–76, 225–42

—— 'Die kirchliche Zugehörigkeit Jakobs von Serugh im Lichte der handschriftlichen Überlieferung seiner Vita unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Pariser Handschrift 177', *OstKSt* 13 (1964), 15–32

Krüger, Paul, 'Johannes bar āphtonājā und die syrische Übersetzung seines Kommentars zum Hohen Lied', *OrChr* 50 (1966), 61–71

—— 'Neues über die Frage der Konfessionszugehörigkeit Jakobs von Serugh', in *Wegzeichen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Prof. Dr. Hermenegild*

M. Biedermann OSA, ed. E. Suttner and C. Patock, Würzburg: Augustinus 1971, 245–52

Krüger, Paul, 'Die sogenannte Philoxenosvita und die Kurzvita des Jakob von Serugh', *OstKSt* 21 (1972), 39–45

—— 'Ein zweiter anonymer memra über Jakob von Serugh', *OrChr* 56 (1972), 112–49

Küng, Hans, *Die Kirche*, Freiburg: Herder 1967

—— *Christianity: Its Essence and History*, London: SCM Press 1995

De Lacy, E. O'Leary, 'Severus of Antioch in Egypt', *Aeg* 32 (1952), 425–36

Lamy, Thomas Joseph, 'Profession de Foi addressée par les Abbés des Couvents de la Province d'Arabie à Jacques Baradée', in *Actes du Onzième Congrès International des Orientalistes Paris 1897*, vol. iv, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1898, 117–37

Lang, Uwe Michael, *John Philoponus and the Controversies over Chalcedon in the Sixth Century: A Study and Translation of the* Arbiter, Leuven: Peeters 2001

—— 'John Philoponus and the Fifth Ecumenical Council: A Study and Translation of the *Letter to Justinian*', *AHC* 37 (2005), 411–36

Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World, ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1999

Lazarus, Ludwig, 'Ueber einen Psalmencommentar aus der ersten Hälfte des VI. Jahrhunderts p. Chr.', *WZKM* 9 (1895), 85–224

Lebon, Joseph, *Le Monophysisme Sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique*, Leuven: van Linthout 1909

—— 'La christologie du Monophysisme Syrien', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 425–580

Leclerq, Henri, 'Diptyques', in *DACL* IV.1, 1045–1170

Leppin, Hartmut, 'Kaiserliche Kohabitation: Von der Normalität Theodoras', in *Grenzen der Macht. Zur Rolle der römischen Kaiserfrauen*, ed. Christiane Kunst and Ulrike Riemer, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag 2000, 75–85

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G., *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2001

Lim, Richard, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1995

Lienhard, Joseph T., 'The "Arian" Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered', *TS* 48 (1987), 415–37

Littmann, Enno, 'Zur Topographie der Antiochene und Apamene', *ZS* 1 (1922), 163–95

Louth, Andrew, 'Trishagion', in: *TRE* 34 (2002), 121–4

de Lubac, Henri, *Corpus Mysticum. L'Eucharistie et l'Église au Moyen Age. Étude historique*, Paris: Aubier 1949

—— *The Splendour of the Church*, London: Sheed & Ward 1956

Maas, Michael (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005

MacCoull, Leslie S. B., ' "A Dwelling Place of Christ, a Healing Place of Knowledge": The Non-Chalcedonian Eucharist in Late Antique Egypt and its Setting', in *Varieties of Devotion in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. S. Karant-Nunn, Turnhout: Brepols 2002, 1–16

MacDonald, Jeffrey L., 'The Christological Works of Justinian', Ph.D. Thesis, Washington DC 1995

—— 'Leontius of Jerusalem's *Against the Monophysites* as a Possible Source for Justinian's *Letter to the Alexandrian Monks*', *Byz.* 67 (1997), 375–82

MacMullen, Ramsay, 'Judicial Savagery in the Roman Empire', in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990, 204–17

—— 'The Historical Role of the Masses in Late Antiquity', in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990, 250–76

Mango, Cyril, 'The Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople and the Alleged Tradition of Octagonal Palatine Churches', *JÖB* 21 (1972), 189–93

—— 'The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus Once Again', *BZ* 68 (1975), 385–92

Mango, Marlia Mundell, 'Patrons and Scribes indicated in Syriac Manuscripts, 411 to 800 AD', *JÖB* 32.4 (1982), 3–12

—— 'Where was Beth Zagba?', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983), 405–30

—— 'The Production of Syriac Manuscripts, 400–700 AD', in *Scritture, Libri e Testi nelle Aree Provinciali di Bisanzio*, ed. G. Cavallo, G. De Gregorio, and M. Maniaci, vol. i, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 1991, 161–79

Markus, R.A., 'Carthage—Prima Justiniana—Ravenna: An Aspect of Justinian's *Kirchenpolitik*', *Byz.* 49 (1979), 277–302

Martindale, J. R., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1980

Mateos, Juan, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine. Étude historique*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1971

Mazal, Otto, *Justinian I. und seine Zeit. Geschichte und Kultur des Byzantinischen Reiches im 6. Jahrhundert*, Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau 2001

McCormick, Michael, 'A Liturgical Diptych from Coptic Egypt in the Museum of Fine Arts', *Muséon* 94 (1981), 47–54

McGuckin, John A., 'The "Theopaschite Confession" (Text and Historical Context): A Study in the Cyrilline Re-interpretation of Chalcedon', *JEH* 35 (1984), 239–55

—— *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*, Leiden: Brill 1994

McLynn, Neil, 'Christian Controversy and Violence in the Fourth Century', *Kodai* 3 (1992), 15–44

—— *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Berkeley: University of California Press 1994

McPartlan, Paul, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1993

Meier, Mischa, *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians. Kontingenzerfahrung und Kontingenzbewältigung im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2003

—— 'Die Inszenierung einer Katastrophe: Justinian und der Nika-Aufstand', *ZPE* 142 (2003), 273–300

Menze, Volker, 'Die Stimme von Maiuma. Johannes Rufus, das Konzil von Chalkedon und die wahre Kirche', in J. Hahn and Ch. Ronning (eds.), *Literarische Konstituierung von Identifikationsfiguren in der Antike*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2003, 215–32

—— 'Priest, Laity and the Sacrament of the Eucharist in Sixth Century Syria', *Hugoye* 7.2 (2004) [http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/Vol7No2/HV7N2Menze.html], pars. 1–21

—— 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*: John of Tella, His Eucharistic Ecclesiology and the Establishment of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in Exile', *OrChr* 90 (2006), 44–90

—— 'Johannes von Ephesus und Kaiser Justinian: ein Missionar, sein Patron und eine Heidenmission in Kleinasien des 6. Jahrhunderts', in E. Winter (ed.), *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Kleinasien in der Antike. Festschrift für Elmar Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag*, Asia Minor Studien 65, Bonn: Habelt (forthcoming 2008)

—— 'Jacob of Sarug, John of Tella and Paul of Edessa: Ecclesiastical Politics in Osrhoene 519–522' (forthcoming 2008)

Meyendorff, John, 'Justinian, the Empire and the Church', *DOP* 22 (1968), 43–60

—— *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church 450–680 A.D.*, Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1989

Mingana, Alphonso, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts: Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oaks, Birmingham*, 3 vols., Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons 1933–9

Mitchell, Stephen, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, vol. ii: *The Rise of the Church*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1993

Moeller, Charles, 'Un Représentant de la Christologie Néochalcédonienne au Début du Sixième Siècle en Orient: Nephalius d'Alexandrie', *RHE* 40 (1944/5), 73–140

—— 'Le Chalcédonisme et le Néo-Chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la Fin du VIe Siècle', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 637–720

Mommsen, Theodor, *Römisches Strafrecht*, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot 1899

Moorhead, John, *Justinian*, London and New York: Longman 1994

Mullett, Margaret, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*, Aldershot: Variorum Ashgate 1997

Nau, François, 'Corrections et additions au catalogue des manuscrits syriaques de Paris', *JA*, XI série, 5 (1915), 487–536

Noethlichs, Karl Leo, 'Anspruch und Wirklichkeit. Fehlverhalten und Amtspflichtverletzungen des christlichen Klerus anhand der Konzilskanones des 4. bis 8. Jahrhunderts', *ZSRG.K* 76 (1990), 1–61

—— 'Iustinianus (Kaiser)', in *RAC* 19 (2001), 668–773

Nöldeke, Theodor, 'Zur Topographie und Geschichte des damascenischen Gebietes und der Haurângegend', *ZDMG* 29 (1875), 419–44

Olinder, Gunnar, *The Letters of Jacob of Sarug. Comments on an Edition*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift n.f. 34.8, Lund and Leipzig: Gleerup and Harrassowitz 1939

Oort, J. van and Roldanus, J., *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, Leuven: Peeters 1997

Palmer, Andrew, *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier: The Early History of Tur 'Abdin*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1990

Paverd, Frans van de, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiochia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1970

Pazdernik, Charles, ' "Our Most Pious Consort Given Us by God": Dissident Reactions to the Partnership of Justinian and Theodora, A.D. 525–548', *ClA* 13.2 (1994), 256–81

Peeters, Paulus, 'Jacques de Saroug. Appartient-il à la secte Monophysite?', *AnBoll* 46 (1948), 134–98

Peeters, Paulus, 'Hypatius et Vitalien. Autour de la succession de l'empereur Anastase', *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 10 (1950), 5–51

Perrone, Lorenzo, 'Christian Holy Places and Pilgrimage in an Age of Dogmatic Conflicts: Popular Religion and Confessional Affiliation in Byzantine Palestine (Fifth to Seventh Centuries)', *POC* 48 (1998), 5–37

Pewesin, Wolfgang, *Imperium, Ecclesia universalis, Rom. Der Kampf der afrikanischen Kirche um die Mitte des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer 1937

Ploeg, J. P. M. van der, *The Christians of St. Thomas in South India and their Syriac Manuscripts*, Bangalore: Dharmaram 1983

Poggi, Vincenzo, 'Severo di Antiochia alla Scuola di Beirut', in *L'Eredità Classica nelle Lingue Orientali*, ed. M. Pavan and U. Cozzoli, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana 1986, 57–71

Rahmani, Ignatius, *Studia Syriaca*, vol. i, Sharfeh: Typis Patriarchalibus 1904

Rahner, Hugo, 'Leo der Große, der Papst des Konzils', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. i, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1951, 323–39

Rapp, Claudia, 'Christians and their Manuscripts in the Greek East in the Fourth Century', in *Scritture, Libri e Testi nelle Aree Provinciali di Bisanzio*, ed. G. Cavallo, G. De Gregorio, and M. Maniaci, vol. i, Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 1991, 127–48

Rebillard, Éric, *Religion et Sépulture. L'Église, les vivants et les morts dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales 2003

Richard, Marcel, 'Proclus de Constantinople et le Théopaschisme', *RHE* 38 (1942), 303–31

Richards, Jeffrey, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages 476–752*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1979

Richter, Siegfried G., *Studien zur Christianisierung Nubiens*, Studien und Kulturen des christlichen Orients 11, Wiesbaden: Reichert 2002

Rist, Josef, 'Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor: Überlieferung, Inhalt und theologische Bedeutung', in Martin Tamcke (ed.), *Syriaca. Zur Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen*, StOKG 17, Münster: Lit 2002, 77–99

Roey, A. van, 'Les Débuts de l'église jacobite', in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. ii, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, Würzburg: Echter 1953, 339–60

Romans and Barbarians, Boston: Museum of Fine Arts 1976

Roldanus, Johannes, 'Stützen und Störenfriede', in J. van Oort and J. Roldanus, *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, Leuven: Peeters 1997, 123–46

Rompay, Lucas van, 'A Letter of the Jews to the Emperor Marcian concerning the Council of Chalcedon', *OLoP* 12 (1981), 215–24

—— 'Proclus of Constantinople's "Tomos ad Armenios" in the Post-Chalcedonian Tradition', in *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History*, ed. C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz, and L. van Rompay, Leuven: Peeters 1985, 425–49

Rosen, Klaus, 'Iustinus I (Kaiser)', in *RAC* 19 (2001), 763–78

Rousseau, Philip, 'Monasticism', in *CAH*, vol. xiv, ed. Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins, and Michael Whitby, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2000, 745–80

Roux, R., 'The Concept of Orthodoxy in the *Cathedral Homilies* of Severus of Antioch', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 488–93

Rubin, Berthold, *Das Zeitalter Iustinians*, 2 vols. (vol. ii ed. C. Capizzi), Berlin: de Gruyter 1960/95

Sachau, Eduard, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin 23 (2 Parts), Berlin: A. Asher & Co 1899

Schieffer, Rudolf, 'Zur Beurteilung des norditalischen Dreikapitel-Schismas. Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie', *ZKG* 87 (1976), 167–201

Schurr, Viktor, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der 'skythischen Kontroversen'*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh 1935

Schwartz, Eduard, 'Über die Reichskonzilien von Theodosius bis Justinian', *ZSRG.K* 11 (1921), 208–53

—— 'Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians', in SBAW.PH 2, Munich 1940, 32–72

Scott, Roger D., 'Malalas, *The Secret History* and Justinian's Propaganda', *DOP* 39 (1985), 99–109

Segal, J. B., *Edessa: 'The Blessed City'*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1970

Selb, Walter, *Orientalisches Kirchenrecht*, vol. ii: *Die Geschichte des Kirchenrechts der Westsyrer (von den Anfängen bis zur Mongolenzeit)*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1989

Shahîd, Irfan, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, vol. i, Parts 1 and 2, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks 1995

Snively, Carolyn S., 'Iustiniana Prima (Caričin Grad)', in *RAC* 19 (2001), 638–68

Sotinel, Claire, 'Emperors and Popes in the Sixth Century: The Western View', in Michael Maas (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005, 267–90

Speigl, Jakob, 'Die Synode von Heraklea 515', *AHC* 12 (1980), 47–61

Speigl, Jakob, 'Das Religionsgespräch mit den severianischen Bischöfen in Konstantinopel im Jahre 532', *AHC* 16 (1984), 264–85

—— 'Leo quem Vigilius condemnavit', in *Papsttum und Kirchenreform. Historische Beiträge. Festschrift für Georg Schwaiger zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Weitlauff and K. Hausberger, St Ottilien: Eos 1990, 1–15

—— 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *OstKSt* 43 (1994), 105–53

—— 'Formula Iustiniani. Kircheneinigung mit kaiserlichen Glaubensbekenntnissen', *OstKSt* 44 (1995), 105–34

—— 'Synoden im Gefolge der Wende der Religionspolitik unter Kaiser Justinos (518)', *OstKSt* 45 (1996), 3–20

Speyer, Wolfgang, *Büchervernichtung und Zensur des Geistes bei Heiden, Juden und Christen*, Bibliothek des Buchwesens 7, Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1981

Stathakopoulos, Dionysios Ch., *Famine and Pestilence in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Empire: A Systematic Survey of Subsistence Crises and Epidemics*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2004

Stegmüller, Otto, 'Christliche Texte aus der Berliner Papyrussammlung', *Aeg* 17 (1937), 452–62

Stein, Ernest, 'Cyrille de Scythopolis. À propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres', *AnBoll* 62 (1944), 169–86

—— *Histoire du bas-empire II*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer 1949

Steppa, Jan-Eric, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2002

—— 'Anti-Chalcedonianism, Hellenic Religion and Heresy in Zacharias Scholasticus' *Life of Severus*', *StPatr* 42 (2006), 249–53

Strommenger, Eva, 'Ausgrabungen in Tall Bi'a', *MDOG* 125 (1993), 5–31

—— 'Die Ausgrabungen in Tall Bi'a 1993', *MDOG* 126 (1994), 11–31

Suermann, Harald, *Die Gründungsgeschichte der Maronitischen Kirche*, Orientalia Biblica et Christiana 10, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998

—— 'Der Bericht des Johannes von Ephesos über die Missionierung der Nubier im sechsten Jahrhundert', in *Symposium Syriacum VII. Uppsala University, 11–14 August 1996*, ed. René Lavenant, OCA 256, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1998, 303–13

Sunderland, Anne, 'Daniel of Salah: A Sixth Century West Syrian Interpreter of the Psalms', *ByzF* 24 (1997), 51–61

Taft, Robert F., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. iv: *The Diptychs*, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium 1991

—— 'Trisagion', in *ODB* 3 (1991), 2121

Taylor, David G. K., 'The Manuscript Tradition of Daniel of Salah's Psalm Commentary', in *Symposium Syriacum VII 1996*, OCA 256, Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale 1998, 61–9

—— 'The Christology of the Syriac Psalm Commentary (AD 541/2) of Daniel of Salah and the "Phantasiast" Controversy', *StPatr* 35 (2001), 508–15

—— 'Bilingualism and Diglossia in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia', in *Bilingualism in the Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, ed. J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002, 298–331

Tchalenko, Georges, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord. Le massif du Bélus à l'époque romaine*, 3 vols., Paris: Paul Geuthner 1953–8

Tiersch, Claudia, *Johannes Chrysostomus in Konstantinopel (398–404)*, STAC 6, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2000

Trombley, Frank R., 'Paganism in the Greek World at the End of Antiquity: The Case of Rural Anatolia and Greece', *HTR* 78 (1985), 327–352

Uthemann, K.-H., 'Antimonophysitische Aporien des Anastasios Sinaites', *BZ* 74 (1981), 11–26

—— 'Der Neu-Chalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus. Ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus', *StPatr* 29 (1997), 373–413

—— 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Aug.* 39 (1999), 5–83

Vaggione, Richard P., *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000

Vailhé, Simeon, 'Jean le Khozibite et Jean de Césarée', *EOr* 6 (1903), 107–13

Vasiliev, A. A., *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1950

Voicu, Sever J., 'Cesaria, Basilio (*EP. 93/94*) e Severo', *Aug.* 35 (1995), 697–703

Volp, Ulrich, *Tod und Ritual in den christlichen Gemeinden der Antike*, Leiden: Brill 2002

Vööbus, Arthur, *Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde*, 2 vols., CSCO 307, 317, Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO 1970

—— 'The Origin of the Monophysite Church in Syria and Mesopotamia', *ChH* 42 (1973), 17–26

—— 'Neue Entdeckungen für die Biographie des Severus von Antiochien von Jōhannān von Bēt Aphtōnjā,' *OstKSt* 24 (1975) 333–7

—— 'Entdeckung neuer Handschriften des antijulianischen Pastoralschreibens', *OrChr* 66 (1982), 114–17

—— *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: A Contribution to the History of Culture in the Near East*, vol. iii, CSCO 500, Leuven: Peeters 1988

Vries, Wilhelm de, *Sakramententheologie bei den syrischen Monophysiten*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1940

Vries, Wilhelm de, 'Primat, Communio und Kirche bei den frühen syrischen Monophysiten', *OCP* 18 (1952), 52–88

—— *Der Kirchenbegriff der von den Rom getrennten Syrer*, Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum 1955

Watt, John W., 'A Portrait of John bar Aphtonia, Founder of the Monastery of Qenneshre', in *Portraits of Spiritual Authority: Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, ed. Jan W. Drijvers and John W.Watt, Leiden: Brill 1999, 155–69

Watts, Edward, 'Winning the Intracommunal Dialogues: Zacharias Scholasticus' *Life of Severus*', *JECS* 13 (2005), 437–64

Weltecke, Dorothea, *Die «Beschreibung der Zeiten» von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199). Eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographischen Kontext*, Leuven: Peeters 2003

Wessel, Susan, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004

Whitby, Michael, 'John of Ephesus and the Pagans: Pagan Survivals in the Sixth Century', in *Paganism in the Later Roman Empire and in Byzantium*, ed. Maciej Salamon, Cracow: Universitas 1991, 111–31

Wießner, Gernot, *Christliche Kultbauten im Tur 'Abdin*, vol. 4.1, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1981/2

Wigram, William A., *The Separation of the Monophysites*, London: Faith Press 1923

Williams, Rowan, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 2001

Winkelmann, Friedhelm, 'Einige Aspekte der Entwicklung der Begriffe Häresie und Schisma in der Spätantike', *Koinaonia* 6 (1982), 89–109

Winkler, Dietmar W., 'Miaphysitism: A new Term for Use in the History of Dogma and in Ecumenical Theology', *The Harp* 10 (1997), 33–40

—— 'Monophysites', in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, ed. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, and O. Grabar, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 1999, 586–8

Witakowski, Witold, 'Chronicles of Edessa', *OrSuec* 33–5 (1984–6), 437–98

—— *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē: A Study in the History of Historiography*, Studia Semitica Upsaliensis 9, Uppsala 1987

Wright, William, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols., London: British Museum 1870–2

—— *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1901

Wyrwa, Dietmar, 'Drei Etappen der Rezeptionsgeschichte des Konzils von Chalkedon im Westen', in *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien*

zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon, ed. J. van Oort and J. Roldanus, Leuven: Peeters 1997, 147–89

—— 'Leo I., der Große', in *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur*, ed. Siegmar Döpp and Wilhelm Geerlings, Freiburg: Herder, 3rd edn. 2002, 447–9

Zeiller, Jacques, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain*, Paris 1918 [reprint Rome: di Bretschneider 1967]

Zotenberg, Hermann, *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaïtes) de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, [Paris:] Imprimerie Nationale 1874

Index

Abraham bar Kayli, Chalc. metropolitan of Amida 49, 115, 121, 137, 139, 195
  archvillain of Syrian tradition 116f
  carrier of 119, 141
  rule of 141, 159, 161, 178, 235–44
Acacius, Chalc. patriarch of Constantinople 32, 93, 95, 98, 100–1, 253, 275
  condemned by the *libellus* 67, 69–70, 73–4, 87–9, 96
  Acacian schism 266
Addai, chorepiscopus 133–4
Agapetus, pope 174, 196, 245, 268
  in Constantinople 197, 200, 203, 205–6, 227
Alexandria 32, 68–9, 82, 126, 137, 204, 209, 212–4, 267, 271
  diptychs of 77, 84–5, 100
  patriarchate of 6, 7, 44–5, 70, 149, 151, 189–90, 213, 254
altar(s) 149, 155, 157, 160, 223
  and diptychs 68, 84
  anointed by John of Hephaestu 224–5, 262, 269
  and John of Ephesus 261–2
Amantius, non-Chalc. eunuch 24–6, 28, 30
Amida, metropolitan city of Mesopotamia I 49, 54–5, 109–11, 119–20
  riots by monks in 10, 111–12, 114–19
  monks and monasteries around 121–2, 142, 191, 194
  rule of Abraham bar Kayli in 141, 159, 178, 236–44
  corpse of Mara translated to 137, 164, 214
Anastasius, emperor 21–3, 26, 29, 31, 34, 44, 95, 172, 232, 241
  and diptychs 32, 77, 86
  and Hormisdas 71–3, 95
  and Trisagion 166, 168, 170
Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople 190, 195–209, 217–18, 221, 224, 234, 236, 268
anti-Chalcedonian(s) *see* non-Chalcedonian(s)
Antioch
  patriarchate of 6–7, 43–55, 57, 68–71, 74, 78, 87–8, 101, 109, 120, 123, 146–7, 149, 151–5, 164–5, 167, 169, 177–81, 186–7, 192, 226, 268
  church/clergy of 29, 46, 48, 51, 55–6, 90, 167
  monks of 29
  primacy of 90
Antoninus, non-Chalc. bishop of Aleppo 4, 156–7, 183
Apamea 44, 82, 109, 132
Apollinaris, bishop and theologian 62
  Apollinarian forgeries 66
apostolic church 90, 92, 105, 181, 272, 276
  faith 274–6
  past 8, 62, 85, 90, 92, 94, 102, 104
  see *see* Rome
Arabia 109, 123–4, 222
archimandrites 155, 224, 267
  of Syria II 95–6, 150
  letters by 123, 125, 129
  expelled 131–4
  and ordinations 177–8
Arius, presbyter from Alexandria 12, 199, 202
  Arians/Arianism 6, 12–3, 169, 269
  non-Nicene(s) 12–4, 104, 167, 232
Armenia 118, 122, 130, 239
  Armenian(s) 130, 138, 143, 171
ascetic(s), non-Chalcedonian 107–9, 194–6, 203–4, 207, 218, 221, 224, 230–1, 236–9, 254–5
Asclepius, Chalc. metropolitan of Edessa 113–14, 118, 129, 135, 141

Asia (Minor) 87, 151–2, 207, 256–62, 264, 267
Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria 13–4, 47, 62–3, 170

Balkans 19, 22, 33
baptism 8, 19, 155, 158–9, 178, 184, 240–1, 262
  rebaptism 158
Bar Yohannan 115–16, 120, 237
Basiliscus, emperor 92–3
Batnae 127, 150
Byzantium 187, 208, 227–8, 256

Caesarea, city in Cappadocia 34–8, 42
Caesarea, city in Palestine 34–8, 41
Caesaria the Patrician 137, 158–9, 262
Calandio, Chalc. Patriarch of Antioch 168–9, 171
Callinicum 108, 114, 121, 129
canons *see* non-Chalcedonian(s), canons
Cappadocia 34–8, 42
Caria 257, 259, 264
Celestine, pope 68–9
Chalcedon, Council of 2, 6–8, 12–18, 22, 38, 61–3, 69, 80–1, 92–3, 99, 112, 115, 148, 166–7, 198, 265–6, 270–1, passim
  as a disciplinary council 16, 99, 202–3
  canons of 99, 254, 265
  controversy over Chalcedon *see* Christology, controversies/debate over
  doctrine of Chalcedon 16, 43, 62, 134, 186, 201, 228, 241, 254, 257–8
  Chalcedonian(s) passim
    bishop(s) 32, 34, 36, 43–4, 56, 58, 61–6, 72, 112, 121, 141, 146–7, 173, 202, 246, 261–2, passim
      and diptychs 85, 87, 98
    church(s) 3, 73, 144, 185, 192, 205, 208, 272
    church life 146
    clergy/deacon(s)/priest(s) *see* clergy
    eastern 56, 69, 71, 86–9, 96–7, 99, 173, 201–2, 268, 270
    western 95, 250, 266, 270
    Eucharist *see* Eucharist
    faith *see* faith
    monks *see* monks
    policy 17, 22, 56, 131, 141, 185
    rule 9, 264
    sacraments *see* sacraments
    saints *see* saints
  Chalcedonianism 19, 21, 56, 119–20, 142, 257–8
  neo-Chalcedonian(s)/neo-Chalcedonianism 34, 37–43, 56, 88, 172–3
Christian(s)
  eastern 7, 68, 72–4, 84–5, 89
  groups 15–16, 55, 234–5, 254, 256
  tradition 8, 13, 66, 85–6
Christology 6–7, 12, 34, 64–5, 92, 152, 221
  dyophysite 2, 3, 7, 14–15, 51–3, 67, 99, 127, 201, 231, 234, 252 *see also* Chalcedon, doctrine of
  miaphysite 2, 7, 62–3, 233
  neo-Chalcedonian *see* Chalcedon
  controversies/debate over 11, 12–18, 59, 64, 76, 78, 82, 85, 102, 104, 107, 113, 118–19, 123–4, 128, 131, 137, 139, 144, 149, 153, 198, 207, 220–1, 229, 233, 249, 258
Chronicle of Zuqnin 4, 271–3
church(es) passim
  Christian/universal Church 1, 86, 90, 94–5, 101–2, 192, 233
    foundation of the 68, 89–92, 101–2, 145, 181, 192
  church of the empire/imperial church 3, 6–7, 11–12, 60, 179, 186, 192, 195, 205, 245–6, 254, 263, 269, 272, 275–6
  Coptic Church *see* Egypt
  unity of the church(es) 18, 187, 206, 248, 250–1, 265
Church Fathers 61–66, 68, 79, 87, 91, 137–8, 145, 153, 167, 170–1, 174, 182, 220, 235, 269, 273, 275
Cilicia 53, 78, 84, 155
clergy
  chorepiscopus 128, 131, 133–4
  Chalcedonian (/deacon(s)/priest(s)) 29, 32, 43, 48, 52, 83–4, 95–6, 128, 147, 150, 160, 163–4, 183–4, 192, 197, 202–4, 216, 254, 271

non-Chalcedonian 10, 46, 99, 119, 147–8, 151, 153–4, 156–8, 165, 175, 179, 182–4, 191–2, 223–4, 226, 269
deacon(s) 84–5, 128, 149, 159, 162–3, 176, 180–4, 191, 193, 213, 220, 245, 260–1
priest(s) 10, 111, 128, 131, 134, 147, 150, 152, 154, 158–61, 163–5, 175–86, 191, 194–5, 211, 219, 224–6, 241–2, 245, 260–1, 264, 269–71, 276
Cometas, soldier 162–3
commemoration (of the past) 4–6, 9, 27, 59, 76, 81–2, 194–5, 198, 207, 214–5, 227, 229, 236, 244–5, 272, 275–6
Constantine, non-Chalc. metropolitan of Laodicea 4, 156–7, 183, 220, 268
Constantinople 7, 19–35, 25–30, 36, 41–2, 56, 77–8, 93, 103, 166, 168–71, 175, 195–9, 203–6, 208–12, 243, 258, passim
non-ecumenical councils in 4
council in 448 15
council in 518 28–30, 43, 46, 56, 96–7
council in 536 97, 110, 135, 190–1, 198–9, 201, 205, 208, 221, 254, 265
court in 4, 14, 22–5, 36, 41, 48, 66, 73, 172, 204, 208, 210, 214, 217–19, 221–2, 226, 228, 252, 255, 263, 267
and Rome 7, 16, 31–3, 39, 44–5, 67–75, 87–8, 247–50, 255
First Council of 62, 269
Second Council of 9, 223, 246–9, 255, 265–70, 272
riots in 10–1, 23, 42, 166–8, 173, 187
people of, Constantinopolitans 22, 154, 167, 189, 259
clergy of, Constantinopolitan clergy 27, 32, 197, 200, 203–5, 254
and diptychs 28–9, 47, 77–8, 85–6
patriarchate of 31, 71–2, 87–8, 196–7, 226
debate in 58–67, 94–101, 118, 126, 151, 154, 186, 196, 234, 252
palace of Hormisdas 58, 154, 218, 222–4
non-Chalcedonians in 108–9, 129, 151, 154–5, 186–90, 194, 204, 216–18, 220–1, 223–6, 235, 238, 246, 250, 254–6, 259
Constantius II, emperor 14, 116
council(s), ecumenical 9, 12, 14, 62, 66, 92, 95, 98, 110, 132, 205, 247, 271; *see also* Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon
Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria 7, 14–15, 68–9, 78, 94, 170, 270, 275
letters/works of 63–4, 66, 233–4
and diyptchs 76, 78–9, 81, 84
Cyrillian legacy/tradition 34, 39, 66, 95, 100, 104, 248
Cyrillian faith 42, 64, 201, 203
Cyril, Chalc. bishop of Scythopolis 104, 171, 227, 241
Cyrrhus 51–3, 55, 82, 84
Cyrus, non-Chalc. metropolitan of Edessa 95, 150
Cyrus, bishop of Tyana 41–2

Daniel of Salah 132–3, 139, 143
Dara 119, 237, 243
Dardania 19, 267
deacon(s) *see* clergy
Didymus, non-Chalc. bishop 184–5
Diodore of Tarsus 51, 63, 78–81, 99, 127
Dionysius, metropolitan of Tarsus 84–5
Dioscorus (I), patriarch of Alexandria 14, 61–3, 68–70, 82–3, 94–5, 201–4, 250
diptychs 8, 10, 36, 49, 76–89, 94, 96–102, 104, 146, 165, 175, 250, 273, 276
in Constantinople 27–9, 32, 47, 73, 86, 199, 201
libellus and 59, 68–9, 73, 75, 92, 94, 98–102

ecclesiology 1, 181
Edessa 50, 54, 83–4, 107, 110–14, 117–18, 122, 135, 137–8, 142, 150, 193, 243
Egypt 7, 14, 45, 91, 112, 128, 130, 137–8, 152, 190, 192
  as place of exile for non-Chalcedonians 44, 53, 77, 150–3, 156, 175, 180
  Egyptian (/Coptic) Church 44, 77, 151–2, 223–4
Elias, bishop of Caesarea 35–7, 41
Elias, author of the *Life of John of Tella* *see* John of Tella
Encyclical, Counter-Encyclical 92–4, 102
Ephesus 33
  First Council of 14, 62–3, 68–9, 78, 99, 199, 248
  Second Council of 15, 61, 70, 132–3, 139–40, 202, 276
Ephrem of Amida, Chalc. patriach of Antioch 119–20, 141, 169, 185, 196–8, 202, 217, 226
  descent to the East 110–11, 118, 130, 135, 231, 233–4
Epiphanius, Chalc. patriarch of Constantinople 60, 88, 190, 196
Eucharist(s) 8, 145–6, 148, 163, 173, 191, 276
  and diptychs 68, 76, 85–6
  Chalcedonian 110, 146, 159, 161–3, 240, 242
  non-Chalcedonian 158–65, 175, 184, 223, 225, 259–60, 276
  communities 181, 185, 192, 269
  economic component of 164–5
  eucharistic miracles 160, 230, 234
  eucharistic bread 161
  eucharistic ecclesiology 181
Euphemius, Chalc. patriarch of Constantinople 27–8, 32, 73, 87, 96–7, 103
Euphrasius, Chalc. patriarch of Antioch 50, 57, 88–9
Euphrates 50–1, 56, 106, 112, 117–18, 120–1, 125, 142
Euphratesia 51, 81–2, 84, 122–4
Eutyches 15, 61, 99, 198, 202–3
  in heresiology/Eutychians 35, 62, 68–70, 74, 97, 103, 171, 198–9, 201–2
Evagrius Scholasticus 4, 16, 44, 166, 204, 209, 217–18, 263

faith passim
  Catholic 253
  Chalcedonian 204–5
  Christian 166, 255, 263
  Cyrillian 42
  non-Chalcedonian 55, 208, 231
  orthodox 195, 204–5, 231, 274
  true 68, 100, 247
Felix III, pope 69, 74, 98
Flavian II, patriarch of Antioch 16, 56–7, 103
Formula Hormisdae *see* Hormisdas

Gaianus, Julianist patriarch of Alexandria 189–90
Ghassanids 124, 222–3, 235
Goth(s) 6, 25, 30, 40, 115, 232–3; *see also* Ostrogoth(s)
Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus 63, 80, 170

Harran 135, 162, 193
Henoticon 7, 15–16, 18, 31–2, 44, 56–7, 70, 75, 172, 253
heresy 35, 43, 69–70, 74, 96–8, 202, 231, 268–9 *see also* Arius, Eutyches, Julian of Halicarnassus
  heresiology 68, 70, 74
Holy Spirit 1, 168–70, 174, 261
Hormisdas, pope 4, 77, 86, 89, 95, 105, 173–4, 217, 248
  libellus of 8, 16–18, 40, 58–9, 67–75, 86, 92, 94–5, 97–105, 188, 202–4, 206, 227, 250, 269, 276
    enforcement in Constantinople 32, 74, 88, 96
    enforcement in the East 33, 47, 49–51, 53–7, 77, 83–4, 86, 88–90, 106, 108, 112–13, 120, 124, 131, 142–3, 147, 194–5, 229, 245, 266
  relations with imperial court 36–7, 42–3, 87, 252

Hypatius, Flavius 21, 52, 55
Hypatius of Ephesus 61, 65

Ibas of Edessa 63, 80–1, 99, 248, 265–6
Illyrian(s) 19–20, 267
Innocentius of Maronia 60–5, 98
Isauria 53, 79–80
  Isaurians 46

Jacob Baradaeus 194, 222, 235, 260–2, 264, 270, 274–5
Jacob of Sarug 4–5, 54, 82, 127–8, 150, 164, 185
Jerusalem 22, 35, 43, 88, 163, 230
  patriarch(ate) of 6, 53, 57, 172–3, 205, 216
  insurrection against Juvenal 15, 148–9
Jews 13, 46, 204, 230, 233, 238, 240
John, satrap 119–20
John, patriarch of Antioch 64, 81
John II, patriarch of Constantinople 26–7, 29, 32, 36, 73, 88, 96
John II, pope 174, 206
John bar Aphtonia 125–6, 136, 139–40, 229, 274
John of Beth Aphtonia 217, 272
John the Chozibite 37, 41
John Chrysostom 47, 162, 170
John of Ephesus 3–4, 9–10, 17, 245–6, 268, 271–3, 275–6
  life/missionary work 109, 194, 207, 254–265, 267, 270
  his description of persecutions 109–11, 113–18, 120–2, 130–5, 141–2, 159, 189, 194–5, passim and *see also* persecution(s)
  on non-Chalcedonian ordinations 175–81, 183, 191–2
  his depiction of Anthimus 204, 207
  on Theodora 208, 211, 213–15, 219, 223–6, 228, 252
  misrepresents Abraham bar Kayli 235–45
John the Grammarian 37–8, 42
John of Hephaestu 183, 223–6, 228, 235, 246, 259, 261–2, 269
John, archimandrite of Mar Eusebius monastery 132–3, 140, 183
John Malalas 4, 49, 166, 169, 243
John Moschus 111, 160
John of Nikiu 190, 212
John Philoponus 267, 271
John Rufus 93, 104, 149, 160–2, 172, 229, 234, 258 *see also* Peter the Iberian
John of Tella 50, 129, 139, 157, 195, 246, 269, 274
  works by 4, 9, 153, 159–62, 164, 170, 175–6, 224, 226, 245
  ordinations by 9, 148, 164, 175–86, 191–2, 225–6, 260–1, 269
  life of 55, 58, 61, 106–8, 153–4
  and diptychs 82, 85
  as theologian 90–2, 102
  Life of by Elias 50–1, 153, 162–4, 108, 184, 195, 229–35, 245, 272
Julian of Halicarnassus 139, 152–3
  Julianist(s) 139, 144, 152–3, 177, 180, 189, 265
  anti-Julianist works 125, 139, 144, 153, 177–8
Justin I, emperor 3, 7–9, 11, 16–18, 39–40, 101, 122, 128, 150, 236–7, 245, 248, 274–5
  his religious persuasion 18–22, 251, 253
  his accession to the throne 22–30
  relations with papacy 31–4, 37, 72, 74–5, 141, 266
  installed a new patriarch of Antioch 43–55, 74
  and eastern Chalcedonians 34, 56, 74–5, 86–90, 141
  and non-Chalcedonians 58, 93, 97, 112, 116
  and Theodora 212, 227
Justinian I, emperor 3, 9, 11, 17–20, 30, 78, 97–100, 110, 135, 210, 220, passim
  and theopaschism *see* theopaschism and monks, Scythian
  and theology 40–1, 89, 99, 169–70, 173–5, 202, 250–4, 271
  supporting non-Chalcedonians 129, 207, 218, 223, 228, 236, 254–65, 271

Justinian I (*cont.*)
religious policy of 184–91, 196–208, 210, 212, 216–8, 227, 245–72
Juvenal, patriarch of Jerusalem 15, 149

laity 8, 10, 87, 133, 146, 148, 156, 159, 164–76, 178–9, 185, 224, 258, 276
Lazarus, archimandrite of Mar Bassus 127–8
Leo, pope 6–7, 71, 201, 270
in the diptychs 27, 29, 100–1, 199, 201
Tome of 6–7, 62–3, 74, 100, 112, 201, 203
libellus of Hormisdas *see* Hormisdas
liturgy 1, 8, 144–5, 148, 276
Trisagion and 42, 165–7, 170, 174–5, 189
diptychs and 76, 85, 103, 146, 273
Eucharist and 162, 165–6
Lives of the Eastern Saints see John of Ephesus
Lydia 257, 259, 264

Mabbug 51, 81, 109
Macedonius, Chalc. patriarch of Constantinople 42, 56, 152
and diptychs 27–9, 32, 73, 85, 87, 96
and *libellus* 72–3, 87, 97
relics of 103
Maiuma 130, 149
Mara, non-Chalc. metropolitan of Amida 49, 54–5, 107, 115, 119, 137, 139
in exile 164, 213–215
Marcian, emperor 15, 86
Marcellinus, *comes* 4, 20
Marde 53, 58, 114, 146, 151–3
Mari the Persian 63, 248, 265
Marinus, PPO 21, 170
Marion, non-Chalc. Bishop of Sura 153, 157, 176–7
Mark, apostle 44, 91
Mar Romanus, leper hospice 242–3
martyr(s) 55, 76, 161
martyr shrine(s) 10, 156, 163–5, 238
Chalcedonian 32–3, 56
non-Chalcedonian 91, 136, 231, 239, 241–2
Nestorius as 51, 84
Matthew, apostle 68, 90–1, 108
Menas, Chalc. patriarch of Constantinople 205–6
Mesopotamia (I and II) 45, 53–4, 106, 119–20, 122–4, 152–3, 243
Mesopotamia I 49–50, 110, 112, 114, 117, 142, 237–8
miaphysite(s) *see* non-Chalcedonian(s)
Michael the Syrian 4, 110, 115–16, 237, 257–8, 271–3
Misael, non-Chalc. *cubicularius* 220–1
mission(s), non-Chalcedonian 9, 124, 207, 219, 222–3, 235, 250, 254–265, 270
monks, monasteries
Chalcedonian 28, 31, 46, 126, 143, 196, 205, 239
non-Chalcedonian 57, 106–10, 120–1, 124–44, 146–7, 149, 159, 163–4, 219, 223, 236, 245–6, 267 *see also* specific monasteries as listed below
Amidene 109, 111–12, 114–119, 122, 131–2, 134, 141–3, 244, 246
Edessene monks and monasteries 111–14, 117, 121–2, 134, 142–3
monastic life in Palestine 104
monastery of the Easterners 112–14, 138
monastery of Isaac 152
monastery of Romanus 129
Beth Aphtonia monastery 126
Mar Bassus monastery 127–8, 144, 147, 176–8, 191
Mar Eusebius monastery 132, 139–40, 143
Mar Zakkai monastery 108, 114, 121, 129
Scythians monks 39–42, 48, 172–3
Thomas monastery near Seleucia 125–6
monasteries founded by Thomas the Armenian *see* Thomas, non-Chalc. Armenian archimandrite
monophysite(s) *see* non-Chalcedonian(s)
Musonius, bishop of Meloe 79, 83

nature(s) of Christ 2, 7, 12, 43, 61–2, 64, 66, 106, 112, 198, 201, 209, 220, 233–4 *see also* Christology
neo-Chalcedonian(s) *see* Chalcedon
Nestorius 14–15, 54, 66, 78, 81, 83–5, 92, 97, 202
  in heresiology 35, 62–3, 68, 127, 169, 199, 202
  in diptychs 84–5
  celebration for 51–2, 84
  Bazaar of Heracleides 166
  Nestorian(s)/Nestorianism 3, 39, 53–4, 81, 101, 103, 113, 169, 171, 173
Nicaea, Council of 6, 12–3, 62, 91, 182, 199, 220
  controversy over 12–14, 47, 104
  Nicene(s) (Church Fathers) 12–14, 167, 220, 232, 269
  non-Nicene(s) 12–14, 104, 167, 232
non-Chalcedonian(s) passim
  anti-Chalcedonian(s) 2–3, 154
  miaphysite(s) *see* Christology
  monophysite(s) 2, 15, 43, 138, 168–70, 207, 210, 251, 254, 258
  ascetic(s) *see* ascetic(s)
  bishop(s) passim
  church(es) 3, 9, 60, 99, 103, 111, 156–7, 175, 228, 235, 238, 240, 276
  church life 144, 146–7, 164, 178
  clergy/deacon(s)/priest(s) *see* clergy
  persecution(s) of *see* persecution(s)
  canons 9, 99, 150–1, 153, 155–6, 175–6, 180, 182–4, 192, 226, 269, 276
  ecclesiastical fathers 67, 100, 149, 182, 230, 272, 275
  ecclesiastical (counter-) hierarchy 108, 147–9, 183, 186, 191–3, 226–7, 229, 245, 270, passim
  Eucharist *see* Eucharist
  faith *see* faith
  hagiography 10, 161, 229–30, 244–5, 258, 272, 275
  mission(s) *see* mission(s)
  monks and monasteries *see* monks, monasteries
  network(s) 25, 148–50, 186
  persecution(s) of *see* persecution(s)
  plerophoria 60, 62–3, 66
  sacraments *see* sacraments
  saints *see* saints
  tradition 3, 8–9, 13, 94, 100–2, 104–5, 111, 120, 134, 181–2, 228, 273, 275–6
  non-Chalcedonianism 29, 46, 80, 107, 112, 120, 124, 127–8, 144, 186, 195–6, 199, 206–8, 211–13, 219, 228–9, 245–6, 269, passim
non-Nicene(s) *see* Arius
Nonnus, non-Chalc. bishop of Circesium 153, 176–7
Nonnus, non-Chalc. bishop of Seleucia/Amida 49–50, 119

Oecumene 45, 252
ordination(s), non-Chalcedonian 9, 134, 144, 147–8, 152, 155, 157, 175–86, 191–2, 223–6, 228, 231, 234, 260, 269–70
orthodoxy 13–14, 56, 64, 73, 76, 83, 88, 94, 97, 100, 197, 202, 227, 247, 253, 266
Orontes 125, 127
Osrhoene 45, 50, 53, 106, 110–14, 120, 122–4, 142, 231
Ostrogoth(s) 19, 196, 206

pagan(s)/paganism 161, 192, 207, 222, 232, 242, 256–265
Palestine 7, 14, 36–7, 91, 123, 149, 162, 223
  monks/monasticism in 15, 104, 109, 122, 124, 130, 149
  (theopaschite) theology in 37–8, 41, 53, 56, 173
papacy 7–8, 20, 60, 101, 104, 173
  and (its perception of) the past 68–72, 74–5, 89–90, 92, 206, 266, 269
  relationship to court/emperor 48, 74–5, 206, 250–1, 271
  papal primacy 75, 89
  and the patriarch of Constantinople 88, 96
  and theopaschism 174

past
pre-Chalcedonian 68, 91, 94, 101, 104
post-Chalcedonian 68–9, 92, 100–2, 195 *see also* apostolic past, commemoration (of the past), papacy and (its perception of) the past, and tradition
Patricius 21, 50
Paul, apostle 62, 90–92, 162, 182
Paul, non-Chalc. bishop of Callinicum 125, 193
Paul, metropolitan of Edessa 50, 54–6, 83, 113, 118, 150
Paul the Jew, patriarch of Antioch 17, 43, 48–57, 88–9, 120–1, 141–3, 173
persecution(s) 8–9, 17, 50–1, 108–10, 117, 120–1, 134, 158, 175–8, 191, 198, 234, 244, 261, 272, 274–6, passim
Persia, Persians 52, 58, 91, 109, 112, 184, 231–2
Persian border 53, 57, 117, 146, 152, 184–5, 237, 243
Peter, apostle 68, 89, 90, 200
Peter of Apamea 43–6, 96, 131
and diptychs 82–3, 85
condemned by the papacy 95
in Constantinople 154, 189
condemned by Justinian 200, 205
Peter the Fuller, non-Chalc. patriarch of Antioch 67, 69, 70, 81, 90, 94
condemned by the papacy 95
in the non-Chalc. tradition 100–1, 275
and non-Chalc. network 150
and Trisagion 167–8, 171
Peter the Iberian, bishop of Maiuma 130, 149, 230, 234
Life of 104, 160, 195, 229–30, 233–4
Peter Mongus, non-Chal. patriarch of Alexandria 67, 69, 70, 77, 103, 149
condemned by the papacy 95
in the non-Chalc. tradition 100–1, 275
Petra 213–15
Philoxenus, non-Chalc. metropolitan of Mabbug 9, 16, 54, 90, 107, 182, 273
presided council of Side 35
and Soterichus 36
exiled 51, 55–7
and diptychs 81–3, 85, 102
and the apostolic past 90
condemned by the papacy 95
and the non-Chalc. network 149–50
and the Eucharist 159
and theopaschism 172–3, 175
Philoxenus of Doliche 153, 157
Phoenicia 45, 53, 80, 87, 123–4
Phrygia 257, 259, 264
plague 70, 256, 258
policy/politics
ecclesiastical 88, 188–9, 200, 251, 253, 271
religious 11, 18, 20, 30, 47, 52, 74–5, 92–3, 112, 141–2, 147, 186, 192, 205, 208, 210–11, 214, 216, 218, 227–8, 254, 256, 266–8
priest(s) *see* clergy
priesthood 145, 148, 179, 262
Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople 78–9, 166, 171–2
Procopius 3, 19, 247
account of Theodora 195, 209–11, 213, 218, 222
Ps.-Dionysius *see* Chronicle of Zuqnin
(Ps.-)Zachariah Rhetor 4, 60, 90, 109–11, 113, 121–33, 149, 154, 170–1, 173, 175, 199, 215, 217, 231, 237, 246, 263, 271–3

Qenneshre 49, 109, 125–6

religious controversy/dissent 4, 8–9, 15, 21–2, 207, 212, 256
Rome 7, 19, 39, 55, 86, 227
apostolic see 8, 17, 68–9, 75, 89–90, 173
relations with Constantinople 16, 31–4, 44, 56, 71–4, 87–8, 141

Sabas, Chalc. saint 104, 210, 227, 241
sacrament(s) 1, 8, 10, 145–6, 181
Chalcedonian 134, 146, 158–9, 178–9, 185–6, 242

non-Chalcedonian 111, 128, 144, 146–8, 152, 155, 157–9, 163, 176–9, 181, 185–6, 193, 205, 226, 260–1, 276 *see also* baptism and Eucharist
saint(s) 8, 76
Chalcedonian 171, 210, 227, 241
non-Chalcedonian 101, 133–4, 150, 195, 207, 213, 228–31, 234–5, 240, 245–6, 255, 257, 262, 269, 272–3
schism 16, 31, 71, 73, 247–8, 266, 270–6
schismatic(s) 95, 97–8, 192, 276
Scythian monks *see* monks
Seleucia (Syria I) 49, 109, 119, 125
Seleucia (Isauria) 80, 83
Sergius, non-Chalc. bishop of Cyrrhus 51, 107, 153, 157, 176–7
Sergius, Chalc. bishop of Cyrrhus 51–2
Sergius, non-Chalcedonian holy man 237–40
Severus 4, 5, 9, 13–14, 16, 44, 74, 101, 107, 131, 137, 160, 182, 195, 207, 230, 234, 248, 268–9, 274
letters and network of 23–27, 33, 35–6, 41, 53, 135, 149–51, 156–7, 162, 184–5
opposition against 26–9, 56, 86, 88–9
condemned (by eastern Chalcedonians) 27, 29, 35, 43, 45, 96–7, 110, 136, 198, 200, 205
theology/works of 38, 42, 125, 135–6, 182, 276
and papacy 70–1, 95
and diptychs 76–7, 79–81, 84–5, 89, 100, 102
and apostolic tradition 90
regarded schismatic 98
and ordinations 127, 147, 175–80, 191–2
and Julian(ists) 139, 144, 152–3
and Eucharist 158–9, 162–3
and Trisagion 167–71, 174
Life of 173, 229, 272
in Constantinople 186–91
and Anthimus 197, 201, 203–4
and Theodora 212, 217–21, 228, 241, 252
Soterichus 34–7, 40–2
Stephen, deacon 213, 215
synodical letter(s) 123, 190, 198, 201–2, 205
Syria 7, 14, 47, 124, 142, 152
province Syria I 45–6, 49, 51, 122–4, 152
province Syria II 45–6, 53–4, 83, 85, 95–6, 122–4, 150, 172
council of in 518 43, 96
Syrian Orthodox 2–3, 219, 244, 250, 258, 264, 270–6
Church 2–3, 9, 18, 105, 111, 120, 150, 167, 194, 208, 228–9, 273–6
manuscripts 99, 136–7
tradition 117, 128, 136, 195, 236

Tarsus, metropolis of Cilica I 84–5
Tella 55, 82, 85, 90, 106, 115
Theodahad, Ostrogothic king 196–7
Theodora, non-Chalc. empress 11, 114, 129, 195–6, 199, 208–228, 241, 252
and the non-Chalcedonians 154, 195, 199, 207–228, 236, 245, 250, 254–7, 264, 267, 269, 274–5
before she met Justinian 211–3
Theodore of Mopsuestia 51–2, 54, 63, 66, 99, 127, 248, 265–6
and diptychs 78–81
Theodoret of Cyrrhus 51–2, 63, 66, 99, 127, 248, 265–6
and diptychs 80–2
Theodosius, non-Chalc. patriarch of Alexandria 189–90, 197, 203–4, 207, 209, 220, 223, 225, 234
theology 5, 9, 11, 13, 40, 53–4, 65–6, 221, 250–4
theopaschism 34–43, 53
theopaschite formula 17, 38–42, 57, 74, 171–4, 188–9, 252, 269
theopaschite edict 188–9, 206
Theophanes Confessor 26, 36, 166
Thomas, non-Chalc. Armenian archimandrite 130–1, 138, 140, 143

Thomas, non-Chalc. bishop of Dara 119, 153, 157, 176
Thomas, non-Chalc. bishop of Germanicia 4, 107, 132, 153, 157, 183, 274
Thomas, *dux* of Tella 115–6, 120
Thrace 25, 51, 223–4
Three Chapters controversy 52, 248–9, 251, 253, 265–9, 271
Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople 31–2, 36, 70–1, 85
Timothy (II) Aelurus, patriarch of Alexandria 69–70, 82–3, 94–5, 99, 149
Timothy IV, patriarch of Alexandria 189, 212, 228
Tome of Leo *see* Leo, pope
tradition 3, 8, 10, 16–7, 34, 63, 68, 82, 102, 104, 132, 152, 168–9, 171, 174, 207, 216, 237, 246, 249; *see also* Christian(s), Cyril, non-Chalcedonian(s), and Syrian Orthodox
Tralles 260–1
Trinity (Holy Trinity) 12, 34, 38–9, 92, 168–75
Trisagion 8, 11, 42, 165–175
Tyre 43, 56, 87, 103

Victor of Tunnuna 199, 227
Vigilius, pope 247, 250, 266, 268–70
violence (religious) 13–14, 46, 54, 111–12, 117, 142, 186 *see also* persecution(s)
Vitalian, *comes* 21–3, 25, 30–1, 34, 36, 40, 44

Zachariah Rhetor *see* (Ps.-)Zachariah Rhetor
Zeno, emperor 32, 86, 92
Zooras, non-Chalc. Stylite 154, 189, 200, 205, 259